THE
NEW YORK REVIEW

VOL. II NOV.-DEC., 1906 NO. 3

LIBERAL CATHOLICISM

Vincent McNabb, O. P.

The late Bishop Brownlow in forwarding to his clergy the Joint Pastoral of the English Hierarchy on Liberal Catholicism added the following words:

"It is possible that the term 'Liberal Catholic' may be misunderstood by some, and be supposed to be equivalent to 'Catholic Liberal'; and the Pastoral may thus be supposed to strike at Catholics who are Liberal in politics. Nothing could be further from the mind of the Bishops; for the Catholic Church has among her most faithful children persons of every political party; and there are Catholic Liberals who are quite as loyal and devout members of the Church as Catholic Conservatives. There is a propensity in human nature which prompts us to apply ecclesiastical censures to other people; instead of taking the warnings home to ourselves. The faithful cannot be too much on their guard against imbibing the poison of Liberal Catholicism; but they should be equally careful to abstain from stigmatizing others as 'Liberal Catholics' who may be as loyal to the Church as themselves." (Jan. 1, 1901.)

The wise words of a wise prelate are but a reminder that nowhere more than in ecclesiastical politics and doctrine do words prove themselves the veils of thought. In saying what must be said on the present subject the writer must trust that his readers will go beyond the spoken word to the unspoken thought; and even beyond the thought to the thing if real ambiguity is to be avoided. For on a subject surrounded by undefined frontiers and teeming with unsettled terminology a writer could only hope to avoid ambiguities by leaving the realm of realities for that of intellectual logarithms. So that though I shall not hope, I shall expect to be somewhat obscure; whilst still expecting and hoping to leave the matter a little less obscure than before.

Thus I shall ask you to allow me to condemn once for all whatever we find ourselves obliged to condemn by the Joint Pastoral. Yet I

need not add that we are not therefore obliged to condemn the whole of Liberal Catholicism merely because we are obliged to condemn it as a whole. Nor are we therefore to anathematise the thing because the word is suspect. Have we not heard warm denunciations of the phrase "Catholic Socialism"? yet in point of fact the Church in her relations to religious orders not only approves but favors a form of Socialism; and not only Socialism but Communism! Thus there may be, and the Joint Pastoral says there is, in ecclesiastical matters a definite intellectual or political atmosphere known as "Liberal Catholicism"; this is indeed reprehensible; and yet a certain tone of Liberalism amongst Catholics is allowable in theory and wise in practice.

It may help us to clear the matter in hand if we begin by distinguishing two spheres of Liberalism, viz.: the speculative and the practical, the sphere of thought and the sphere of action, the sphere of culture and the sphere of politics. A man may be liberal in one; and a reactionary in the other. Thinkers are not necessarily statesmen. Nor are there many Prime Ministers who could write or perhaps appreciate the *Foundations of Belief*. In ecclesiastical affairs a Catholic may be a liberal to excess in matters of thought, and medieval beyond endurance in matters of policy. Again, boldness in ecclesiastical policy is not necessarily the outcome of originality in thought. A safe secretary of the Index might play havoc with the Propaganda. A broad-minded Canon-Penitentiary might almost strangle the Holy Office. St. Thomas Aquinas was never elected Prior. St. Gregory and St. Leo are the only Doctors to wear the Tiara. Plato's ideal of statesmen-philosophers viewed historically has remained one of the most foolish dreams of one of the wisest men; so far removed is the sphere of deed from the sphere of thought.

Another distinction is of hardly less practical importance. Liberal Catholics of the exaggerated type are not confined to the laity. Just as it is naive anthropomorpism that adjusts the categories of Church and world by identifying the Church with clerics and the world with laics or with the reigning dynasty, so it is the same immature thinking that identifies liberalism with the lay minds and conservatism with the clerical. For though it may be true to say that that somewhat indefinite thing, the world, cannot flow into the mere abstract Church, still Our Blessed Lord's own gracious parables lead us to expect tares in the broad concrete field, and fruitless branches on the wide-spreading concrete tree of the Church. False liberalism is not a parasite of the mere lay mind. It has no prejudices against clerics. Indeed if we take

the heresiarchs such as Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches and the rest to be classical examples of the liberalism we would condemn, it is regrettable to find that they are not laymen. Most of the detrimental thinking from which the Church has suffered has come from clerics; and as a class we are only tolerable to our Master because in spite of the grievous hurt we have done, He has commissioned us to be the salt of the earth. The very greatness of our mission and of our powers has brought about the evil we have wrought. For all power wherever found, is power for evil as well as for good; and the greater the power, the greater the evil.

A definition of Liberal Catholicism either of the sound or unsound type will hardly be expected from one to whom in both its forms it appears rather as an attitude than an opinion. To the true liberal Catholic false liberalism is something a little less intolerable than heresy and a little more dangerous than schism; for as the Ancren Riwle observes, "a foe that seems a friend is a traitor beyond all traitors." And it not seldom happens that the severe sentence passed by the true liberal upon false liberalism is passed in turn upon the true liberal by those who repudiate both the name and the reality of liberalism.

Liberalism is sometimes so defined as to be synonymous with that definite *mentalité*, to quote a phrase of Fonsegrive—which measures all intellectual propositions or statements whether dogmas or scientific conclusions by the principles and standards of experience. So used, Liberalism becomes identical with what the Vatican Council has called Rationalism. Undoubtedly there is some infiltration of Liberalism into Rationalism or *vice versa*.[1] But a clear distinction

[1]Newman would seem to identify Liberalism with Rationalism in the following passages: "My battle was with Liberalism; by Liberalism I mean the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments." (*Apologia*. Chap. II. 1). "Liberty of thought is in itself a good; but it gives an opening to false liberty. Now by Liberalism I mean false liberty of thought, or the exercise of thought upon matters in which, from the constitution of the human mind thought cannot be brought to any successful issue. Among such matters are first principles of whatever kind and of these the most sacred and momentous are especially to be reckoned the truths of Revelation. Liberalism then is the mistake of subjecting to human judgment those revealed doctrines which are in their nature beyond and independent of it, and of claiming to determine on intrinsic grounds the truth and value of propositions which rest for their reception simply on the eternal authority of the Divine Word." (*ibid.* Appendix, Note A.) The following passage would seem to confirm the distinction between Liberalism and Rationalism: "The most oppressive thought in the whole process of my change of opinion was the clear anticipation verified by the event that it would issue in the triumph of Liberalism. Against the anti-dogmatic principle I

may be made between both; and it is no part of a philosopher's duty to ignore or obscure distinctions. Rationalism as a word never bears a good meaning; Liberalism may mean something good or something bad. There are no orthodox rationalists; but there may be orthodox liberals. It is not easy to state wherein the distinction between the two lies, even though we are quite sure that a distinction does lie between them. Perhaps we shall be near the truth if we say that Liberalism is a leaning, and Rationalism a bent; or that Liberalism is a tone of thought and Rationalism is a dogma; or that Liberalism may be the raw material and Rationalism the finished product. A rationalist is one who looks on himself in theory and practice as everywhere free from the bridle of authority; a liberal Catholic is one who merely acts as though free from the limitations of here and now. A rationalist is a high priest and prophet of reason; a liberal Catholic acknowledges himself the student and even the servant of faith. And if the rationalist has no limitations but those of the mind thinking and the objects thought, the liberal Catholic makes light of the limitations or restrictions of time and place. For, Liberalism not being a dogma but an attitude, the same dogma may to-day characterise an advanced liberal and to-morrow betoken the most orthodox Catholic. Arianism, Nestorianism, Lutheranism are dogmas or denials subject to no change. But the unsafe liberal Catholic of the twentieth century may anathematise his fellow liberal of the nineteenth; and may only deserve a like anathema by his forgetfulness that to anticipate is often as dangerous as to delay; and that the twentieth century must not too hastily take up the methods of the twenty-first.

This leads us to one of the chief elements of Liberalism, false and true. A true liberal is a true loyalist. But his loyalty is to the Church's future no less than to its past. He does not look on to-day as the tomb of yesterday but as the womb of to-morrow. Though the Church's past is one of splendor he looks forward to a more splendid future. For him Christianity is indeed the fulfilment of the promises; but still more is it the bringing in of a better hope. Jesus Christ is a midpoint ending and beginning divine promises. The world the Church covets most is a world that is to be. Its daily prayer is "Thy Kingdom Come!" Its eyes in apostolic days were not turned back

had thrown my whole mind; yet now I was doing more than anyone else could do to promote it. . . . But this was not all. As I have already said there are but two alternatives, the way to Rome, and the way to Atheism: Anglicanism is the half-way house on one side and Liberalism is the half-way house on the other." (*ibid.* Appendix, Note A.)

upon an Eden but forward to a millenium. Thus the true liberal does not look on Christianity as a crucifixion, though it dies daily; but as a resurrection, for behold! it lives. Nor can he see in the Incarnation merely an episode; but an institution. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. A true liberal does not rest his faith on a dead past but on a living present; nor on an historical fact but on an existent reality; nor on an empty tomb but on a Real Presence. Sometimes he seems to disregard history; but this is only his human way of saying that the future is almost more to him than the past. He is impatient when a certain class of Catholics boast of their loyalty, thereby expressing a mere sentiment for what has been, as though loyalty like memory was only retrospective. In Lacordaire's strong phrase, he is "a citizen of the future", and he bows down before the New Era that is to be.

Therein lie his strength and weakness. Because the future is not the past, he is tempted to think that it must be other than the past. Unless closely watched and wisely guided, this feeling may grow to mean that between past and future there must be a break. In his zeal for continuance he may be led on to hold a break of continuity; as if the Church had persistence only at the cost of consciousness. In other spheres this would not matter much, but the Church must be a continuous consciousness. For she has the mind of Christ, and what He was yesterday He is to-day and will be forever.

This element of expectation which is the life—and may be the death—of sound liberalism is joined with a certain insistence on doubt and difficulty. If to look into the present state of the economy of Redemption is to peer through a glass darkly, what must it be to look through the added darkness of to-morrow? A true liberal is a man whose face is set eastward. As he journeys onward he is always an hour's march before the rising sun, in that darkest hour before dawn. He will scarcely allow himself the consolation of seeing each day's sun at mid-day, for that would be to rest on the way, and to falter in pressing forward toward the goal; and for him life and especially spiritual life is movement; and "Not go on is to go back." He lives in an hour of darkness; and makes his dwelling place amidst the clouds.

This again is his strength and weakness. Unless he has the true philosophic attitude of faith he will allow difficulties to usurp the jurisdiction of doubts; ignorance will become error; and, in spite of "malo esse quam videri" things will be taken not to be, because they are not seen to be. In matters of doctrine this attitude leads

some men to leave entrenchments and to go out in the open in the hope of cutting off an enemy who has made a feint of flight. How often have lines of defense been abandoned for no better reason than that they were built yesterday, and now it is to-day; or that they were thrown up in the night and now the sun is shining on them; or that the defenders know better than their foes the weak parts of the defense. Never was a fortress equally strong everywhere; and never was it defended by men who were conscious only of its weakness. But it does not cease to be defensible merely because all its parts are not equally strong; or because no one knows its weakness so well as its defenders. Part strengthens part; nor is it taken until every bastion has been won.

In practical matters the frame of mind which allows difficulties to weigh like doubts, will allow the defects of persons to compromise institutions. But whilst a loyal Catholic may well turn his eyes towards the future, he must not fret his soul because others have the official duty of turning towards the past and looking warily to the Church's steps.

To the elements of Liberalism in general we may now add those of modern Liberalism; which we shall find to take their shape and color from the modern social and intellectual environment.

Liberalism in ecclesiastical politics would seem to be identical with or begotten of a reaction against medieval feudalism. It is profoundly interesting that in feudalism, i. e., in the first definitely Christian civilization we have seen, society is found resting on something like a social pact; and labor is associated not with slavery but with free serfs bound by oath to military service. In pursuance of something like the same principle, the relations between Church and State were fixed by Charters or Concordats, whereby the civil and ecclesiastical powers so bound each other to mutual aid that we find Bishops and Abbots levying troops, and secular judges meddling with theology. In spite of the politic toleration of Jews the common teaching of feudalism was "One Kingdom: One Church." All this reminds us that the age of crusades and charters bore within its heart something of the romantic idealism that had led the Church of Jerusalem into a premature effort after communism. The crisis of feudalism came when Protestantism brought western civilization face to face with the still more complex problem of dealing with men not in the abstract but in the concrete, not with idealised rational animals but with German monks and English sovereigns. But even after three hundred years of struggle feudalism has not yet taken leave of Europe. In

some states it still serves to embody the relations between civil and ecclesiastical powers. Every year however adds to the frailty of its tenure. Even as we speak its last foot-hold in a great continental nation is being washed away by the floods of uprising Socialism. Comparing these feudal relations to a dying man, over-cautious conservatism is the child who will not see death approaching, being blinded by the memory of his father's long years and many illnesses; the false liberal is the child who would hasten the father's death by withdrawing the pillow or by a bustling preparation for the funeral. The true loyal liberal is the child, who, whilst doing his best to keep life as long as possible, would yet prepare for the death which he has so long foreseen and dreaded.

Just as Liberalism in ecclesiastical politics is a counter-current to feudalism, so in ecclesiastical thought is it a counter-current to formalism. Carried beyond its limits this liberal current broadens out into merely destructive criticism. It is significant that Descartes the Gaul and Kant the German, the two most influential thinkers since the 16th century, should have given us the practice and theory of criticism. But criticism is naturally if not necessarily formless and amorphous. Its aim is to make debris; it sometimes ends with chaos. It should not end there, if critics were true to the etymology of their name. For if a critic is a judge, his judgments should be decisions and should stand. The true Catholic liberal thinker recognizes that though the Church is founded on a rock, men build thereon "gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble." From time to time an examination has to be made not of the foundation "which is Christ Jesus" but of the lower courses of masonry laid down by man. This inspection of the lower courses of masonry and rejection of what is old or crumbling is a critical work worthy of the best intellects of the Church. Nowadays much has to be done in the sphere of philosophy and history. Philosophy has to be translated into modern forms of thought or to be revised by a new synthesis of psychological and cosmological data. History has almost to be re-written. In great part only its outlines remain true to fact; and large regions of eventful history have for the first time to be welcomed within its frontiers. Strangely enough, exaggerated liberalism of thought sometimes flees to philosophy and sometimes to history in its protest against the formalism of the past. For the most dominant current in modern philosophy is singularly amorphous and even nebulous; whilst history has almost hrunk back to a bare index and précis-making of past

events, shorn of all the formal and ideal valuations of former ages.

A further element in modern Catholic liberalism is the recognition of rights. It would be straining a threadbare theme to insist on the fact that Christianity has practically created the theory of man's unchartered rights. Medievalism, whether in thought or action, was not altogether freed from the thraldom of petty intellectual and social tyranny. Plato and Aristotle were in the sphere of thought what Constantine and William the Conqueror were in the social sphere. Few, even of the boldest thinkers, dared cast aside the over-lordship of these two "tyrants" of thought. But theirs was a mild Hellenic thraldom, tempered by their graceful καλοσκαγαθια. And in spite of the subtleties of commentators their philosophy is the nearest approach the world has yet seen to organized good sense.

But the sixteenth century at one stroke broke away from the statutory to the natural rights of man as man. Exaggerated liberalism, which is but an over-development of this birth-throe, is too insistent upon its claims and too unobservant of its duties. Sound liberalism is more concerned to grant freedem than to claim it. And outside these two classes a third class is still found for whom the modern and essentially Christian idea of a human being freighted with duties growing into rights and rights resting on fulfilled duties is a disloyalty to a past Christian civilisation.

So far we have assumed that Liberalism is loyalty to the future equally with the past—that it is therefore a keen realisation of difficulty. Moreover in its modern form it includes a democratic counter-current to feudalism and a critical counter-current to formalism joined to an explicit assertion of the social and intellectual rights of man.

The nineteenth century gave us a notable example of true ecclesiastical liberalism in two men born within a few months of each other, John Henry Lacordaire and John Henry Newman. Both were converts; both had been smitten in different degrees by unbelief. Lacordaire was a liberal in action; Newman, in thought. Lacordaire had few difficulties with the Creed; Newman hardly touched ecclesiastical politics. Lacordaire was neither attracted or repelled by the dogmatic side of the Church. Of his conversion he could write, "I have reached Catholic belief through social belief; and nothing appears to me better demonstrated than the argument: Society is necessary; therefore the Christian religion is divine, for it is the means of bringing religion to its true perfection." Newman was actually

kept back by the political action of the Church at the time when he was being drawn to acknowledge her as the covenanted guarantee and guide of dogmatic developments. Lacordaire called himself a "Citizen of the Future" and founded a journal entitled The New Era; Newman left behind the outline of a vast scheme of development. Lacordaire sprang from a nation that was breaking the bonds of feudalism in Church and State; Newman belonged to a State-church that hardly felt its feudal fetters in the profession of dogmatic liberalism. Both the Gallic tribune of the Church and the Anglo-Saxon thinker insisted on the rights of action and thought—Lacordaire, in his phrase "Liberty is not given, it is taken;" Newman in his phrase, "Conscience first, Pope afterwards." Yet both men made their claims for others more than for themselves: Lacordaire thrice bowed to the stern voice of obedience; Newman could write "My own Bishop is my Pope"[2] "A Bishop's lightest word *ex cathedra* is heavy."[3] Lacordaire, although he could say on his death-bed "I hope to live and die a repentant Catholic and an unrepentant liberal" did not recognise that his liberalism energised mostly in his outer life of action; Newman, because he was geographically and ecclesiastically associated with Tory feudalism, detested liberalism in politics to such an extent as not to recognise that he was a Sir Galahad of dogmatic liberalism. Lacordaire was before his age in demanding and employing the three freedoms, of the Press, of Education and of Church Government; Newman in his *Grammar of Assent*, *Development of Doctrine*, and *Essay on Inspiration* has laid down liberal lines of thought in the sphere of Philosophy, Theology and Scripture. Lastly, Lamennais, the apostate French Abbé, throws into relief the sound liberalism of Lacordaire; and Darwin, the spoiled priest of the Establishment and author of a purely biological theory of development, is subtly contrasted with Newman, his pioneer in the sphere of theological development.

From the lives of these two great souls and true liberals it would seem that a lesson is taught to us whose path is beset by even greater dangers than those they so fully overcame. Lacordaire the fearless man of action stands in contrast with Newman the quiet thinker. The man who held Notre Dame spell-bound by his peerless eloquence was above all an ascetic; the seer who won England by the story of his change of soul was a mystic. In that as in so much else their lives and especially their inner lives are still symbolical. Some of us are

[2] *Apol.* Ch. II.
[3] *Ibid.*

beset in the sphere of church government by temptations to an unrestrained political liberalism. Too intent on to-morrow, we are fretful with to-day. For such of us even the terrors of Lacordaire's inflictive asceticism are not without a stern lesson. The student of St. Sulpice who threw the quaint college-caps behind the fire, and the sub-editor of L'Avenir who wrote impassioned pleas for disestablishment had to practise many an hour of rude ἄσκησις before his soul brought itself to its final childlike pliancy in the hands of authority. So steeped in the love of freedom as to allow it no small share in his choice of a religious order, he yet undertook the life of vowed obedience; nor did his life ever lag behind his vow. Child of an age that knew not how to obey, he felt that it could learn and he could teach no better lesson than that of the Son Who was obedient unto death. The dangers springing from the applause of thousands of his fellow-citizens whom he was leading to faith, he stifled under the feet of some simple lay-brother to whom he poured out the humbling story of his sins. He first lived, then preached, Christ crucified. Social theories and ecclesiastical politics became simple to this passionate wooer of the Cross when he recognised that his Master's divine diplomacy was to live what He preached and to give His life for His foes. Personal rights and privileges came to him colored by the thought that the One Who had all rights and privileges emptied Himself of all save that of claiming to be loved by loving unto death those who hated unto death. His whole inner life has been summed up in these striking words: "His love for the Cross was exclusive, passionate; not a platonic love, but a fire that led him to copy the pattern shown him on Calvary. All his mysticism was reduced to this simple principle: To suffer:—to suffer in order to satisfy justice—to suffer in order to prove love." He was a true ascetic; and could therefore dare to be a true liberal. For he bore in his soul the marks of Christ crucified; he sought to blot out the handwriting against the world he lived in by nailing it to the cross; and everywhere as he moved amongst men his life and word preached the truth that the Cross of Christ is alone the redemption and enfranchisement of man.

If Lacordaire was an ascetic, Newman was a mystic. As Lacordaire's sound liberalism grew out of his true asceticism, so did Newman's sound liberalism grow out of his true mysticism. For him a vision was the object and the reward of life. Had he been rapt with St. Paul to a sight of the third heaven, had he seen things which even his golden tongue could not utter, he would have spoken of his rapture

as "seeing through a glass darkly" in comparison with the vision he was to see. Death, to such a soul, could only seem the swift passage "from shadows and symbols to the Truth." Yet he wasted his life in no vain mood of regret for a vision he could nowhere descry in this world of shadows. He had the seer's gift of seeing beyond and within; and of seeing first of all, the dim frontiers of further fields of light. Nature was sacramental to him; it was the garment of God. It was even liturgical and chanted to his soul with solemn voice. Things did not therefore cease to belong to nature because they proved to be divine. And as the meanest flower—a spray of snap-dragon on a college-wall—had thoughts too deep for tears, so did the simplest revealed truth, no matter in what half-forgotten language enshrined, open up vistas of thought along which his great mind ranged to the Infinite. Such a simple phrase as "The Word was made flesh" he could not read without seeing three fathomless mysteries yawning under his feet. To him the formulas of faith were not too shallow but too deep for thought. He had the sensitiveness of those mystics who could not hear the name of God by whomsoever spoken without being borne against their will into high regions of superconscious thought. Filled with the bliss of the divine cloud he showed no fretfulness under the dim lights of the Credo. There were no mysteries for him; but one all-embracing mystery—God. And in that light he saw light, and in that shadow he bore meekly with all shadows. Like St. Teresa, whose soul thrilled whilst chanting the Creed at Mass, his whole mind swayed to the balanced anthitheses of the Creed of Athanasius. He looked upon it almost as the grandest song of faith; for whilst he chanted it, his mind leaped beyond the word to the divine reality and there found itself flooded by the "Blessed Vision of Peace."

Visitors to the Convent of the Carmelites in Paris are shown the cell where Lacordaire prayed; and upon the wall, are still pointed out the blood-marks of his pitiless self-conquest. You have but to go an hour's walk along the Iffley road from Oxford to see the brick-floored cell where Newman knelt to see and stood to write the "master light of all his seeing"—the vision that led him on. Such of us as would dare to tread the way of these two great souls and do some little of the work they left undone, must one day kneel down at least in spirit within those two shrines and learn their lesson. For only when some of the Master's ascetic and mystic self-denial—some of the sorrows or shadows of Golgotha—has mastered our soul may we hope to be true to our freedom and our responsibilities, to our past and our future, to ourselves and to God.

VINCENT MCNABB, O. P.

TWO OF IBSEN'S GREATEST WORKS*

M. D. Petre

As the curtain rises at the opening of Wagner's *Gotterdammerung*, we behold the Norns making their last effort to resist a fate more powerful than that which they have hitherto represented. From the dim beginnings of all things they have woven the destiny of mankind, but now at last heroic courage, personified in man, heroic love, personified in woman, have torn it from the hands of the gods, from the control of the Fates. Man has grown from helpless infancy to self-determining maturity, he has gripped his own life, and will fearlessly, now, mould it according to his own will. And so the thread snaps, and, with a cry, the three sisters plunge down into the depths of the earth, into the abyss of dull, material determinism. In the will that heroically resisted them the Fates themselves have met their fate,

* The article here presented to the readers of *The New York Review* was completed almost the very day of the death of the great Norwegian poet and dramatist, Henrik Ibsen. Hence it has no pretension to deal with the entire life-work of a genius so rare, so subtle, so vast, that the present writer ventures to believe his full greatness is yet awaiting its due recognition from the world of general culture. True indeed, much of his work has enjoyed what we may call a fashionable vogue, and there was a time when to be "Ibsenian" was to be, in a smartly intellectual sense, *up-to-date*. But that moment is even now almost past, and there is an ebb in the tide of Ibsen's social popularity. This is not however to be regretted, for there is a superficial form of general appreciation which may positively block the way to a deeper and truer understanding. Ibsen himself, though all unconsciously, outlived his more flaming popularity, but obtained a deeper recognition from only a scattered few. And now that intellectual *fashion* is turning away, there is danger lest, for a time at least, even earnest minds should pass him by, and miss the enjoyment of treasures which enrich the soul for more than a passing moment. Yet, even so, it is better that the more ephemeral admiration should pass away and leave room for a profounder appreciation.

The following study deals, not with the Ibsen of the *Doll's House* and the other prose social dramas, but with the Ibsen of the two great earlier dramatic poems, *Brand* and *Peer Gynt*. This is not to deny the continuity of the two men, any more than to affirm it, but it is simply to prescind from any comparison between these two layers of work. Also one special point has been selected from the many which might suggest themselves, and it is the contest and contrast between free will and fatality, as exemplified in these two dramas, with which we are chiefly to deal. But this article will serve its best purpose if it induces a few, not, in the words of Bacon, to merely taste and swallow, but to chew and digest these two great masterpieces of literary and spiritual work.

a power which they cannot subdue, but which they must recognise and accept.

But has man in truth been able to free himself from the might of destiny by snatching it from the grasp of those who had hitherto guided it? Though Siegfried and Brunhilde may tear themselves free from the meshes woven by the Norns, there is another web which they are continually weaving for themselves. Their past is the fate of their present, their present is preparing the fate of their future. If young humanity toss its mane and break away from the bridle held of gods, it cannot free itself from the destiny imposed by its own deeds. Even the most free, the most spiritual action, as its results enter into the scheme of an universe which is not all spiritual, prepares for the future a new element of that inevitability from which we may never wholly escape.

Whatever our ultimate beliefs, be they Christian or Pagan or agnostic, the belief in fate is not inconsistent with them; the very doctrine of Providence is not incompatible with it. Fate is, indeed, that element of life which is independent of free will, whether it be the result of our own action, of that of other men, or of nature. It is that which confronts us in the working out of our lives, which can be met and modified, used and resisted, but which cannot be altogether unmade. No one really denies the existence of fate; we differ only in our views as to the method of dealing with it, the extent of its sway.

In *Brand* and *Peer Gynt*, we are presented with two very opposite types of humanity, two men, each of whom endeavors to take his own life in his own hands, to mould it wholly for himself, regardless of the tissue of outer circumstances, in the midst of which every one of us must move. Brand, by strength of will, Peer Gynt by force of imagination, would each make his own destiny, and make it as entirely as though nothing existed outside him. Brand endeavors to raise his exertions to a sphere of pure, spiritual will, where this may be possible; Peer Gynt meets all that would thwart his efforts by his power of self-illusion. The drama is in either case, the story of the attempt and of the failure, a failure which is tragic in both instances, an attempt which is heroic in the person of Brand, grotesque and fallacious in that of Peer Gynt. Neither of them is successful, yet neither is wholly lost; both seem to find salvation at the last; will and imagination each play their part in the moulding of human life, but neither plays a part which is supreme.

I.

BRAND.

At the outset of the drama Brand is introduced to us in a scene well fitted to display the characteristic strength and limitations of the man. He is fighting his way forward through mist and darkness, tempest and snow, mercilessly rebuking his peasant companion, who will not risk his life on such a terrible night, even to reach his own dying daughter.

This is the varied theme of the whole drama—wind, ice, snow, glacier, avalanche and mountain, and the slight, frail form of man, mounting, ever mounting in despite of the awful opposition of nature. In Brand we behold the human will brought into fierce conflict with determinism, the spiritual soul opposing itself to fate. Social convention with its cramping, soul-destroying usages; heredity, with its burden of sin and debt; worldly interest and pusillanimity; religious formality; official duplicity and ambition; popular cowardice and love of ease; these are the enemies of Brand, against which his soul is to wage heroic strife, and to rouse up the energies of mankind.

Man is made to move amidst eternal forces, to gaze on eternal truths, to fulfil vast and eternal duties. But he cowers from the light, he shrinks from his spiritual destiny. Two fancies, says Brand, have ever roused in him a sense of grim mirth, fancies which sprang up in his boyish mind, and found their interpretation in his more mature thought. He pictures to himself an owl, that shrinks in terror from the darkness of all enfolding night, a fish that is haunted with dread of the watery abyss.

"Ah!" he says:
"Whole or sickly, great or small,
Such owls, such fishes, are we all.
Born to be tenants of the deep,
Born to be exiles from the sun,
This, even this, does us appal."

And the same thought is echoed in the cry of his dying mother:

"Why did my soul in flesh take breath,
If love of flesh is the soul's death?"

The owl that is frightened in the dark, the fish that is timid in the deep, are conceptions grotesquely impossible, but grim caricatures of the actual state of man. In the owl and the fish body and soul are entirely fitted to the same purpose, but man has to fight for his own

unity; he has it in him to be terrified of his true destiny, of the very element in which alone his spiritual being can live. With grim determination Brand sets himself to seek that rightful element; the body shall be tortured and destroyed, if need be, but the soul shall live, persistently, unintermittingly, on those heights for which it was made.

Brand is not so entirely unique in his determination to rise to these spiritual altitudes; but his distinction is rather in his resolution never to leave them, not for a single instant. Action and reaction, expansion and contraction, work and rest, these are the ordinary alterations of human life. At one moment the soul bounds onwards in the world of freedom to which it properly belongs, and "whether we be in the body, or out of the body we know not;" but a little later the flesh has once more overwhelmed the spirit, and we must sigh that our sojourning is prolonged. These are the, at least apparent, intervals in our spiritual life, intervals which the Brand temperament will not tolerate. Most men wait then until they are once more lifted up, and wafted on high by the spirit which "bloweth where it listeth;" but Brand will keep himself above by the sheer force of will. "All, or nothing" this is the motto of his life—"nothing," which means the purely natural life, directed and determined by the force of outer circumstances;—"all," which means that which is wholly spiritual and self-determined, guided in all by the omnipotent, personal will. "Know that life's an art," he says to the frivolous Einar; and, again,

> "But help is idle for the man
> Who nothing wills but what he can—"

for he who wills but what he can is willing only on the lower plane of material existence; in the true universe of spirits there is no "can" and "cannot."

It has been said, sometimes in cynicism, sometimes in all reverence and truth, that man makes his own God. Hence we naturally find that Brand, of the unbending will, worships a God who is correspondingly ruthless and omnipotent. Brand and his Maker are in a close, continuous, unintermittent relationship, founded on community of interests and the respective rights of master and servant. God has a clear plan of action, which man is to execute, and to execute without the least failing or defect. This plan of God's is one that *can* be carried out, for it depends on will alone. Everything else may fail, but the will alone carries its own responsibility.

"Not by high, heroic charges
Can you make the People whole;
That which faculty enlarges
Does not heal the fissured soul.
It is Will alone that matters;
Will alone that mars or makes,
Will that no distraction scatters,
And that no resistance breaks.

Come then Men, who downcast roam
The pent valley of my home.
Close conversing we will try
Our own souls to purify.
Slackness curb and falsehood kill,
Rouse the lion's curb of Will.
Manly, as the hands that smite
Are the hands that hold the hoe;
There's *one* end for all,—to grow
Tablets whereon God may write."

These last lines recall those in which Peer Gynt is told that to be "truly oneself is to have Master's intention displayed like a sign-board"—but Brand will have it displayed in the will, while Peer Gynt is condemned because it has not been stamped on his mind. Brand wars on weakness, Peer Gynt's sin is falsehood. Believing as he does, in this omnipotence of will, Brand heaps contempt on the worshippers of a gentle benevolent God.

"What the world calls by that name 'Love,'
I know not and I ask not of.
God's love I recognize alone
Which melts not at the piteous plaint,
Which is not moved by dying groan,
And its caress is chastisement."

And again, in answer to his mother's messenger, who tells him, "God is not quite so hard as you," he bursts forth passionately:

"Yes with that comfort's carrion-breath
The world still sickens unto death;
Prompt, in its need, with shriek and song
To lubricate the Judge's tongue.
Of course! The reasonable plan!
For, from of old, they know the man,
Since all his works the assurance breathe,
'Yon gray-beard may be haggled with.'"

Brand's indignation is inspired not only by a conception of God which seems to him to lessen Divine Might and Majesty, but by the correspondingly low view of man, which insults human dignity by allowing for human weakness.

The next incident after the opening scene of the drama is the meeting of Brand with Einar and Agnes, the young bridal pair, who dance along the mountain side, as they mean to dance through life, with all its possible alternations of grave and gay.

> "In sunshine lies our destined way
> And ends but with a hundred years."

Brand utters his awful words of warning, and tells them that the God to whom they appeal for the justification of such a life is *dead.* On Einar his words fall lifeless and unmeaning, but, in the soul of Agnes, idle joy is dead for ever, mere animal youthfulness is quenched, eternity has dawned and her soul has awakened. "*Sawest thou,*" she whispers in awestruck tones to her companion, "*how he towered as he spoke?*" A little later and Agnes has abandoned Einar for Brand, has chosen the leader of her soul for the master of her heart and affections likewise.

In Agnes we find, though under its feminine aspect, that same unifying instinct which is the guiding principle of Brand. She might, as many women would have done, have kept Einar for her spouse and comrade, and Brand for her director; have given part of her life to time, the rest to eternity. But Agnes, like Brand, has the tragic temperament; the temperament, that is, which can endure no division. "Your scheme," as the Mayor tells Brand later on, is

> "life and faith in unity:
> God's warfare and potato-dressing,
> Inseparably coalescing."

Now the lives which seek such unity are lives inevitably colored and permeated with tragedy, a tragedy deep and unceasing, which runs its course unchanged by outer events. Theirs is a pathos which is woven into the very tissue of the soul; it results from the striving of a dual nature for oneness and peace. In the soul of Brand this unity is to be attained by perfect obedience to his Maker; in the soul of Agnes it is Brand who is to lay open the designs of God. But not for this is her self-donation to the great end less perfect, but rather more so. If Brand find the manifestation in his own mind, and Agnes in that of Brand, her understanding of the call is not for that less spiritual and holy. It is by the quality of her personal apprehension of the new life that she is to be judged, not by the manner in which that apprehension was attained. Though Brand draw back the curtain, it is God whom her soul beholds, and with an ever increasing clearness, at which her husband himself can rightly wonder. There is a more

definite otherness in a human will which guides us to the accomplishment of the eternal law, than in such an isolated understanding of the Divine Will as may easily vary according to our own moods. We find Brand astray several times when Agnes is preserved from all possibility of error by the nearness and evidence of her call. Brand's God is, too often, just Brand himself; Agnes' master and guide can never be identified with her own will and inclination. It is just this element of otherness, more fully developed in her life than in his, which frees her from the many snares of self-illusion, and lifts her to an heroism of detachment which he hardly reaches.

And yet in the life of Agnes love plays its part openly and fearlessly, while in that of Brand it is admitted, but ever under protest. He thinks that the will can be pure only in proportion to its isolation and entire self-reliance. Love introduces into the life of each mortal a dependence on the lives of others—only in naked loneliness is the will supreme.

Agnes cannot fully agree with the teaching of her husband; she does not attempt it; but, in the fulness and purity of her nature, there is an instinct which guides her more truly than his ruthless logic. His will is ever wakeful to resist the determination of material necessity and the influence of other men, but he is blind to the self-made determinism which his own action must ever engender. He resists the earthly tenderness which might blind him to eternal issues; he forgets that his own intention and purpose have also their limitations, and may interpose themselves between him and the larger end. It was not that his nature was loveless; had it been so he would never have placed his ideal in this state of utter detachment. He fell into the too common error of the ascetic, and thought that what was hard must be right, just because of its hardness. Between man and man, between man and God, there was to be no room for love until the battle of life was ended.

> "Never did word so surely prove
> The smirch of lies as this word Love:
> With devilish craft, where will is frail,
> Men lay Love over, as a veil,
> And cunningly conceal thereby
> That all their life is coquetry."

Agnes answers, with only partial agreement:

> "Yes, it is false: yet still I fall
> Questioning: Is it, after all?"

"Yes, yes," he insists:

"First the Will
Law's thirst for righteousness must still,
You must *first* will;"—and then:

"If Will have conquered in that strife,
Then comes at length the hour of Love,
Then it descends, like a white dove,
Bearing the olive-leaf of life."

This is indeed to make a Sunday from which every feature of the week-day is absent; a Heaven wherein the strivings of earth are rendered void and useless since the prize has no relation to the contest. Agnes is not less heroic in her sacrifice; she gives up first the life of her son, and then, at the bidding of Brand, tears from her heart the pining and regret in which, like many a stricken mother, she was expending the rest of her vital power. But all the time she is sanctifying and not denying her love. And when the last sacrifice is consummated, and with a bound her soul breaks through the barriers of flesh and time and gazes on the eternal God, her victory is crowned by the vision of her child's glory.

"Will hath conquered in the fray,
Cloud and mist are swept away.
Through the night, athwart the Dead,
Streaks of morning glimmer red.
Graveyard! Graveyard! By the word
Now no more a tear is stirred;
By the word no wound is riven,
Risen is the child to Heaven."

Agnes has not conquered love, but has transmuted its temporal form into eternal substance. Now she must go, for "Who so sees Jehovah dies!" the life that has been wholly unified can no longer be clothed in flesh and blood. But Brand must remain, for his battle is not yet over, his lesson is not yet learned. He cries out in his desolation, but she tells him she cannot remain unless both descend to a lower level. Their union has been based, not on the love of each one for the other, but on the love of both for that which is greater.

Brand is left solitary to carry out his plan of the great church, which by its vastness, is to raise men to nobler ideas of their Maker and of their spiritual destiny. But the moment of apparent success is, for him, that of utter failure. He is made to realize, by mayor and provost, that his work is to serve their purposes and not his own. Casting the key into the river he calls on the people to follow him,

and makes his last desperate effort to free himself from fate and circumstance, to make life and destiny by one supreme act of will, in utter detachment from all but the eternal.

And thus we see him at last, as at first, mounting, ever mounting, through snow and ice; abandoned by all but the foolish Gerd. The phantom of compromise, his life-long enemy, makes one last attempt to wring from him the repudiation of his motto—"All or nothing." But, heroic to the last, even though his God slay him, yet will he trust in Him, he will *yearn* even though he cannot attain. And now at last the day of peace is about to dawn, and the great Brand is to find God's answer in his defeat and humiliation. "Man," asks the crazy Gerd, "why have you never wept before?" Why did he not recognize his own pathetic weakness and that of others, in a world of mingled flesh and spirit, necessity and freedom? Brand has striven to overrule himself, his neighbor and his fate, but his Master turns out to be not so ruthless as he had imagined, and, as the stricken hero sinks beneath the avalanche the last word he hears is a voice, through the thunder, saying that "God is Love." "All or nothing."—Yes, but who shall measure the all of which the human will is capable, until the book is opened in which fate and freedom keep their true accounts? Not only what we can do, but even what we can will, is measured by much which is not in our own control; our very faculty of *yearning* is not omnipotent, but subject to ebb and flow. A kernel of spiritual freedom is ever there, but not to be clearly recognized until the curtain of time rolls up and only eternity is before us.

II.

PEER GYNT.

In Peer Gynt, a work, if we may say so, even more stupendous than that which we have been considering, Ibsen gives us just the opposite type to that which he presented to us in the person of Brand. Here again we have the human soul depicted in its relation to its outer environment, to the world of foreign and opposed wills, of material necessity and all-pervading fate. But while Brand seeks to conquer destiny by strength of will, Peer Gynt, on the contrary, would cheat and efface it by force of imagination and untruth.

This type of phantasy, of subjectivism, of unfulfilled performance, begins life as the son of a rich, spendthrift, hard-working Norwegian farmer. The mother, of whom he inherits his keen imag-

inative faculty, as he draws his worldly ambition and braggart ostentatiousness from his father, passes her solitary, forsaken days with her son, and, while the husband is scattering the hard-earned fortune to the winds, these two console themselves and forget the impending misery, while their imaginations riot in old tales and legends, which they repeat to one another, amplify and dramatise. We see this strange pair, while ruin and starvation close in upon them, all oblivious of their cares, absorbed in the tale of the heroic steed Grane, and deaf to the howl of the wolf at their own door; riding an improvised carriage of chairs and tables to the magic castle which lies "west of the moon and east of the sun," and, meanwhile, not noticing that the walls of their own house are crumbling, and the roof falling in.

Dearly poor Ase pays for the strange education she has given her boy. The husband dies, having squandered the inherited fortune, and she finds herself left destitute, with a son who can imagine anything, can promise everything, but can perform nothing. Their life is spent in continued alterations of sympathy and antagonism. Ase looks for help and support, and gets them only in the shape of fairy tales and day-dreams. She breaks out into complaints which are drowned by the wild stories which her son pours forth, stories which he has remembered and not invented, but which he reproduces as his own personal adventures, with such force and thrill of fancy, that poor Ase is once and again enthralled, and forgets the pressing, material necessity in the seductive, mental vision. She cannot help delighting in the perverted imagination of her son, an imagination which he has inherited from herself; and over and over Peer Gynt charms away her objurgations by his wild fantastic lies. His genius is the genius of absolute egoism; every great event, of which he hears, has happened to himself; every great deed, which has been achieved, it is himself woh has performed it.

Now it is possible to be an egoist without being a genius, and had Peer Gynt been such, he had not succeeded in fascinating his mother and so many others by his tales. But a genius he was, with his strange flashes of illumination; his wild plans and conceptions; his irresistibly seductive power over other minds. A genius he showed himself also in his faculty for seeing the very unreality and filminess of his own visions, which the glamor of his imagination often concealed from others. "Lies—all lies—a pack of lies!" he says to himself again and again, in the very midst of his wildest and most fantastic dreams.

We shall not, I think, get the true lesson from Peer Gynt if we regard him as a mere empty boaster. A stupid egoist goes on contentedly in his own dull round, deceived himself even more than he deceives others. In Peer Gynt there was always a part which was undeceived and undeceiving; a fact which shows the worse for his moral conduct, but the better for his mental faculties. And it is just this remaining instinct of truth and reality which saves the personality from utter extinction, and inspires the faith which two women, his mother Ase, and Solfeig, his wife, preserve to the last.

The drama opens with a scene in which Ase bitterly reproaches her son for his month-long absence during the busiest season of the year. He answers her with a thrilling account of his ride on the back of a reindeer along the sharp, scythe-like Gendin-Edge. It is an old story, and Ase knows it well, yet so vivid is the coloring, so intense the conception of the tale her son narrates, that she listens breathless, with horror and suspense, and her imagination plays her the old trick; she forgets, for a moment, the immediate and very real grievance. And we can forgive her, for it is a wonderful tale, and one of the most living descriptions which artist has ever written. He tells of the awful jump downwards from the giddy height, whence they look:

> "Straight into the tarns that slumber,
> Black and sluggish, more than seven
> Hundred fathoms deep below you."

As they fall, they cleave "through banks of mist," "through a flock of sea-gulls," and rush "to meet their own reflection in the still pool beneath—down crashes the buck, up rushes the reflection, till

> "Buck from over, buck from under, in a moment clashed together."

Poor Ase is roused from her momentary thrill by the recollection of how she had heard the story in her childhood, but Peer Gynt has won his victory all the same. He is his mother's own son, and she, her son's own mother.

Next we are transported to the neighboring farm of Hegstad, where Peer Gynt weakly goes to behold the wedding of the woman he might have won. Thinking of his failure as he goes along the road, he flings himself on his back, gazes into the sky, and sees his own future glory depicted thereon. It is always when reality presses on him most disagreeably that Peer Gynt, like others of us, finds refuge in the world of dreams. He does not meet his fate and conquer it, but flies it and denies it; makes it non-existent so far as imagination can do so, but succumbs to it wofully in fact and reality.

Full of his dreams of future empire he goes down among the wedding-guests; he is alternately mocked and encouraged; he drinks, loses his head, and finally makes off with the bride. But, before doing this, he has met Solfeig, and the one genuine feeling and passion of his life has been kindled. He leaves the bride to return to her own people, and wanders into the forest, an outlaw for the crime he has just committed. All the fortune that is left him is in his own riotous mind and imagination, saving only the true and pure remembrance of one who loved him for what he was, and not for what he was not. Solfeig, like Peer Gynt, is a type, as he of deceit, so she of sincerity; as he of change and instability, so she of calm and constancy; as he of fancy without fact, of word without deed, so she of silent thought and unshaken love.

But we have seen that Peer Gynt had something real still left within him, deep buried as it was under selfish lies and conceits. It was with this hidden and scanty but *genuine* self that he loved and revered Solfeig; and it was likewise this *real*, and not the fictitious Peer Gynt whom Solfeig loved, to whom she devoted her life, and whom she swore to preserve. We shall see later on whether and how she did it.

We must now follow our hero through the momentous events which form a turning point in his life. He is alone in the wilderness, and may not leave it under pain of death. He is face to face with Nature, in all her solemn and stern necessity. Now, if ever, he will wake up to the realities of existence; he will learn that a man is made, not by self-engendered fancies and ambitions and aspirations, but by victorious wrestling with the powers of nature and a masterful accommodation to that which is inevitable. And, for a moment, it seems that such will be the result. He bounds along the hillside and exclaims:

> "This is life! Every limb grows strong as a bear's!
> To crush, overturn, stem the rush of the foss,
> To strike! Wrench the fir-tree right up by the root!
> This is life! This both hardens and lifts one high!
> Away then with all of the savourless lies!"

But soon he is caught again in the too fascinating web of his imaginations; he conjures up visions of his great future, of the home rebuilt and magnificent, of his glorious journeys in foreign lands. "Peer Gynt," he exclaims, "thou art come of great things, and great things shall come of thee;" with these words he dashes his head against a rock, comes into contact with necessity, and falls senseless.

When we next find him, he is making his first steps towards the kingdom of the trolls. A green-clad woman, daughter of the so-called Dovre-King, monarch of the trolls, is conducting him to her father's palace. Peer Gynt has at last found a liar equal to himself, and they are obviously delighted with each other's company. The future bride informs her lover that

> "All our possessions have twofold form;
> When you shall come to my father's hall
> It well may chance you're on the point
> Of thinking you stand in a dismal moraine."
> *Peer.*
> "Well now with us it's precisely the same.
> Our gold will seem to you litter and trash!
> And you'll think, mayhap, every glittering pane
> Is nought but a bunch of old stockings and clouts."

which in very deed it is, for Peer and his mother have been, unknowingly, living by the same system as the trolls.

Then continues the green-clad one: "Black it seems white, and ugly seems fair," and Peer answers: "Big it seems little and dirty seems clean." "Ay, Peer," exclaims the lady, as she falls on his neck, "now I see that we fit, you and I," and thus they enter her father's hall, an affianced couple.

The next scene is one of the most powerful and important of the whole drama. In the mind of Ibsen troll-dom represents that state of consummated fantastic illusion in which fiction positively dominates fact, the unreal is more potent than the real. Here man is unmade, his personality dissolved, his unity broken into fragments and reflections. Peer Gynt is placed before the troll-king, is invited to assume their nature and adopt their customs. Had he accepted all, even to the last condition, we could have followed the tale no further; Peer Gynt would have been a phantom and no longer a man. But he shrinks from the last step and saves himself from entire dissolution. The element of reality which we have before recognized, prevails; a man, even the most unreal, is something more than a troll.

First he is asked to attend to nothing outside the Ronde bounds, and is told, in a wonderful line, worth much study and thought:

> "Day you must shun, and deeds, and each sunlit spot"

which is to say, no more fact, no more light, no more knowledge and certainty. So far Peer accepts. Then he is told wherein the difference between a troll and a man really consists.

"Out yonder, under the shining vault,
Among *men*, the saying goes: 'Man be thyself.'
At home here with us, 'mid the tribe of the trolls,
The saying goes: 'Troll to thyself be enough.'"

"Man be thyself" this is the call to be human in the highest sense; to fill out the possibilities of our nature; to take our part in the world in which we were created as men amongst other men.

But the troll dictum imposes a law of entire subjectivism. "Troll to thyself be enough," that is, make your own truth, make your own facts, let no outer or greater reality enter within that court of imagination wherein self is enthroned.

Not understanding all that the motto means, Peer allows it to be graven upon him, and thus begins the tragedy of his life, for the troll is a creature of pure imagination, and can live in its own element, but in man there is a remnant of reality which must ever resist complete immersion in lies.

There follow other cynical conditions, and, at last, the king proposes to injure the left eye, so that it may see awry, and to remove the right eye entirely, thus committing his proposed son-in-law to a state of things which can never again be altered. This is too much for our hero, he shrinks from the irremediable. In vain the old man explains to him that his

"eyes are the fountain
Of the bitter and searing lie of tears."

but Peer will not accept the condition:

"To know that one can never free oneself,
That one can't even *die* like a decent soul."

He is saving up some reality for the end. There follows a ghastly and appalling scene, intensely vivid and powerful. Peer Gynt falls, with a cry to his mother for help, under a heap of imps: they scatter at his call, fancy yields to one strong and real emotion, and he is freed. But he has found to his cost that the fancies, which are only foolish amongst men, are deadly real in the kingdom of the trolls, and his experience does not end with this terrible night—the results of his imagination are to pursue him during long and evil years.

The next scene describes Peer Gynt's adventure with the Boyg: another strange being, whose nature is to be learned in Norwegian folk-lore. Peer finds himself in pitch darkness, and encompassed by some strange, slimy, circular being, which offers a deadly and unconquerable resistance, but neither strikes nor attacks. He had been

told in the hall of the trolls that *the Dovre-King's gate did not open outwards*, and, though he has escaped, it is to suffer a lasting obsession in some form or other. Wildly he strikes round at the invisible obstacle—"Who art thou?" he cries—and the answer comes, "Myself." Says Peer: "Clear the way." But the Boyg answers: "Go *roundabout*, Peer." This word "roundabout" is to accompany us through the rest of the drama. It is a curse which has been laid upon him, and henceforward, until his last saving effort, he is to go ever "roundabout," never "straight through." "Who are you?" he shrieks again. "Myself" answers the Boyg once more, and adds, with cutting satire: "Can you say the same?" Alas! he cannot, and once more the great Peer Gynt, the future emperor, is broken and defeated, and owes his rescue to the intervention of the ever watchful Solfeig. For the Boyg will not even fight him. It conquers without fighting, it enmeshes him on every side; his weakened mind and will can do nothing; only by force of his one true affection for Solfeig, and of hers for him, is he saved, and the Boyg yields to those who are behind him.

Again the scene changes, and Peer Gynt is building his hut in the forest. As he hacks at the trees he now bemoans his sad and solitary fate, and the curse of trolldom which lies upon him, and now takes refuge from it all, in the usual lying fancies of future greatness. One curious incident occurs, which we will note as it leads later to one of the most beautiful passages of the book. He sees a lad furtively chop off his own finger, and run away with a rag tied round his hand. His object is to escape conscription, and Peer, who would have been quite as unwilling as the youth to go a soldiering, looks on with mingled wonder and approval. He would escape himself by any means he could, but not by paying such a definite price.

> "Ay think of it," he says, "*wish* it done—*will* it to boot—
> But *do* it!—No, that's past my understanding."

These words are characteristic of the entire man.

But as Peer completes his house, putting strong bars that can shut out "all the cantankerous little hobgoblins," he is greeted by an unexpected visitor. Solfeig, the ever loving, ever watchful, has come to share his life and fate. He has sent her a message from his lonely place of exile, and she has responded. We may ask in wonder why she should do it; what there is in Peer to inspire such devotion. It can only be that she alone has understood and cared for that hidden kernel of manhood which he yet retains. And his conduct to her,

and to her only, shows that her faith is not mistaken. He asks her why she came, she answers:

> "One message you sent me by little Helga:
> Others came after in storm and in stillness,
> Nights full of heaviness, blank empty days
> Brought me the message that now I must come.
> It seemed as though life had been quenched down there,
> I could nor laugh nor weep from the depths of my heart,
> I knew not for sure how you might be minded;
> I knew but for sure what I should do and must do."

All the best and truest in Peer Gynt is roused. Away now "with nails and planks! No need now for bars against hobgoblin thoughts." In all reverence and love he prepares the house to receive her. But alas! the curse is still upon him, and, in the midst of his joy the "green-clad" one arrives, leading by the hand his own child, and professing her intention never to leave him. Angrily he denies the parentage, but she answers, with taunting pity, that it is indeed hard on him, but he must suffer, though for "nothing but thoughts and desires."

Bitterly now he recognizes that to stay with Solfeig were to taint her with the poison of his own existence—he must "roundabout" as the Boyg told him; there is for him no way, as yet, "straight through." In one exquisite line he expresses the tragedy of the situation, saying:

> "Where you'd have the sward green, you must mind not to trample"

and the sward of his own heart and affections has been sadly trampled and discolored. Sorrowfully he exclaims to himself:

> "Roundabout, lad; though my arms were as long
> As the root of the fir, or the pine tree's stem,—
> I think even then I should hold her too near,
> To set her down pure and untarnished again."

Then to Solfeig he says only that he must go, he has something to fetch, and "be his way long or short, she must wait." And Solfeig's last word a word most fully redeemed is: "Yes, I'll wait." And there she does wait, during his long wanderings and wasted years.

We must now pass over much that follows. Peer Gynt goes to foreign lands, and by dint of keen imagination, cunning and unscrupulousness, makes himself a fortune and position, which he alternately loses and regains. Each succeeding vicissitude leaves him on a lower plane, poorer and less dignified. As he says of himself:

> "I soared with train and golden scabbard—
> And plopped down on all fours again."

He sinks from a king of merchants, to a king of apes; after this he has a short adventure as a false prophet; he next tries science and history, but his crowning glory is when he finds himself in a lunatic asylum, the elected king of madmen. At each new failure, with its consequent change to a lower level, he at once consoles himself with the promise of being Cæsar in his new condition, the Cæsar of the wild beasts and apes, if nothing better; but each time he equally fails to take any real and practical step towards the achievement of even this low ambition. And another prevailing illusion is with him throughout—he persuades himself, and tries to persuade others that, throughout all his varying fortunes he has ever been himself, and that it is never his personal self that has fallen. This is the crowning lie of all, for Peer Gynt is anything, everything, but never, during all this period, is he himself, except in the sense described by the madman, who tells him that, in the lunatic asylum:

> "We go, full sail, as our very selves,
> Each one shuts himself up in the barrel of self,
> In the self-fermentation he dives to the bottom,
> With the self-bung he seals it hermetically,
> And seasons the staves in the well of self.
> No one has tears for the other's woes,
> No one has mind for the other's ideas;
> We're our very selves, both in thought and tone."

This is pure, unmitigated egoism and subjectivism, that self-isolation which most properly issues in madness. And this is just the selfdom of Peer Gynt; fallacious and visionary; not drawing continual sustenance from the world of objective truth and reality, but feeding on its own fictions, and deeming itself independent because it has no root in the heart of nature and of all things.

At last Peer Gynt, now an aged man, makes his way home, is shipwrecked and cast homeless on the shores of his native land. As a stranger he wanders once more amongst the scenes of his earliest remembrances, and meets everywhere the grinning, ghastly ghost of his own reputation, a shade which dares to walk the earth even before the last remnant of its substance has departed. For Peer Gynt and his lies have become famous memories, and the country-people enter readily into the sport when Peer proclaims an auction, and sets up for sale, one after another, all the false parts he has played in life. First the palace in the Ronde, which must be taken on faith; then the steed Grane, which is racing far away in the West; then his Kaiserdom, his

crown of straw, his prophet's beard, his madman's gray hair, all are scattered amongst the crowd for whatever they may fetch.

Stripped now of all his assumed personalities Peer is next found crawling near the woods and gathering wild onions His search takes him near the old hut where Solfeig has waited all these years. Broken and aged, he draws near to this scene of sacred remembrance; the spot where he performed the one worthy deed of his life, going away to save her whom he loved from his own evil fate. He hears her praying for him, and rising to his feet, a man once more, he says solemnly:

> "One that's remembered—and one that's forgot,
> One that has squandered—and one that has saved."

But not yet can he venture into the little hut and find salvation, much more has still to be faced; he has sold all his false parts, he has now to face and reckon with the true ones, which he ought to have played, but never played. He is pursued by the thoughts he would not think, by the messages he never gave forth, by the songs he should have sung, by the tears he should have shed, by the deeds he should have done. As balls of thread, as withered leaves, as sighs in the air, as dewdrops, as broken straws, they follow him over the heath and he flies from them only to meet a worse fate.

Now come the weird scenes in which Peer Gynt endeavors to save his personality from utter dissolution at the hands of the Button-moulder. This odd person is charged with the duty of gathering up half-destroyed and disintegrated personalities, and melting them together in order to produce, from many imperfect casts, one or two good specimens. He is not concerned with the fate of lost souls, but of lost personalities; those who have let mind and will be scattered by falsehood and unreality, whose life has been a dream and not a substance. And this is the man who is to shatter Peer Gynt's last illusion, for though he has lost faith in his many plays and parts, he still cherishes the vain conceit that he has, at least, been himself throughout. But the Button-moulder ruthlessly tears the veil from before his eyes; he has not indeed been much of a sinner, "for both vigor and earnestness go to a sin," but

> "Yourself, you have never been at all;
> Then what *does* it matter, your dying right out?"

What is it then, Peer Gynt asks him, this being oneself? the Button-moulder answers:

> "To be oneself is: to *slay* oneself.
> But on you that answer is doubtless lost,

And therefore we'll say: to stand forth everywhere
With Master's intention displayed like a sign-board."

As we have already pointed out, these words are almost the same as those used by Brand, when he speaks of the "Tablets whereon God may write."

In the life of Ibsen by Henrik Jaegar we are reminded, in relation to this theme, of the maxim of Oersted: "Forget yourself, but do not lose yourself." Peer Gynt has done just the opposite, and now he is summoned, in dread judgment, to answer for his own reality; to prove it if he can; if not, to yield up the last memory thereof.

And now indeed, after many years of evasion, after many shifts and many lies, Peer Gynt is brought face to face with necessity and fate, and as Brand learned that he could not conquer it by sheer force of will, so he knows, at last, that neither can it be wiped out by denial and self-illusion. And in seeing this and acknowledging it Peer is not lost but found, for, as his soul stands naked and shivering, and as fate wraps her icy arms around it and claims it all her own, another reality also makes itself felt besides that of ruthless material necessity. The will is not all, and imagination is not all, and fate is not all, for Love is above all and enters into all. Peer Gynt has forgotten, but Solfeig has remembered; Peer Gynt has loved neither God nor man, but Solfeig has loved both, and in her heart they have never been sundered.

In his despair, before hope has been once more kindled, Peer Gynt utters his last confession:

"So unspeakably poor, then, a soul can go
Back to nothingness, into the grey of the mist.
Thou beautiful earth, be not angry with me
That I trampled thy grasses to no avail.
Thou beautiful sun, thou hast squandered away
Thy glory of light in an empty hut.
There was no one within it to hearten and warm,
The owner, they tell me, was never at home.
Beautiful sun and beautiful earth,
You were foolish to bear and give light to my mother,
The spirit is niggard and nature lavish,
And dearly one pays for one's birth with one's life.
I will climb up high, to the dizziest peak;
I will look once more on the rising sun,
Gaze till I'm tired o'er the promised land;
Then try to get snow-drifts piled up over me.
They can write above them: Here *No One* lies buried."

As he speaks the Button-moulder comes on him again, but he has, meanwhile, approached closer and closer to Solfeig's hut, and redemp-

tion is at hand. Once more the curse of the trolls obsesses him, and he is tempted to go *roundabout*—but no—

"this time at least
"Right through, though the path may be never so strait."

And now long waiting is rewarded, the seed of reality which was preserved in Solfeig's love, is saved from utter dissolution. "Where was he," he asks her, during all these years of dream and falsehood. And Solfeig answers that he lived all the time, " in her faith, in her hope, in her love."

M. D. Petre.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE:

III. ITS CONSTRUCTIVE ASPECT.

Francis E. Gigot, D. D.

The leading principles of the Higher Criticism of the Bible are not new or arbitrary canons set up for the purpose of weakening confidence in time-honored positions and of substituting untried novelty for firmly-established traditions. They are nothing else than the rational rules which scholars, lay and clerical, have freely used of yore to determine the author, date, sources, manner of composition, historical value, etc., of ancient works, secular and ecclesiastical. They are the acknowledged means whereby students of literary and historical criticism have sucessfully reared the edifice of science with regard to the uninspired productions of the past. Hence, one can readily understand why the Higher Critics of the Bible feel confident that the careful and unbiased application of the self-same principles to the human element of the sacred writings, will make for the actual building up of scriptural science.

It is quite true that in applying these valid rules to the examination of the literary and historical problems which center in Holy Writ the students of the Higher Criticism of the Bible have greatly increased the number of what is often called "negative" positions. Time and again, they have reopened, and left opened, questions which our ancestors regarded as settled. But it does not follow from this fact, that their sole, or even chief, purpose is to propound negative solutions. They are well aware that scriptural science, like every other science, must be positive in its general aim and leading conclusions. They fully realize that purely negative statements should not constantly be put forth as the last word of the questions discussed, that they should still less be considered as susceptible of being erected into a system that would appeal to and satisfy the natural craving of the human mind for positive knowledge. At the same time, they cannot but feel entitled to the right which is universally allowed to the other investigators of truth. Like the students of geology, biology, physics, history, or even theology, they think that they may freely

test time-honored positions by means of recently-ascertained facts, and respectfully, yet firmly, negative erroneous explanations however ancient and widely-received. According to them, if truth is ancient, so is also error, and as both are unavoidably mingled in man's inadequate knowledge, one who wishes to further genuine advance in any line must carefully discriminate between them, accept the one and deny the other. It is for the same reason, they tell us, that they subject to tests at least as severe the various theories which their fellow Higher Critics have framed to account for the facts ascertained by recent Biblical study. They know that in these new solutions also, error may exist side by side with truth, and they think it their plain duty to look closely into such theories and to treat as positive additions to human knowledge only those conclusions which have a right to be considered as such. In both cases, they are actuated, not by a secret and unworthy design of doing away with whatever was regarded as solid before them, but by the sincere desire of using exclusively tried and sound materials for the building up of scriptural science.

That the Higher Critics of the Bible really aim, as a body, at doing constructive work, is more directly evidenced by the manner in which they utilize every particle of truth that may be contained in their sources of information, old and new. It is with this object in view that, at the beginning of their inquiry into each important literary or historical question concerning Holy Writ, they state impartially ancient traditions bearing on the point at issue, together with the chief grounds in their favor. Should they, upon the examination of these grounds, think that the traditions are but partly true, they carefully refrain from treating the traditional positions as if altogether worthless. Much rather do they endeavor to determine the amount of truth contained therein, and to modify the ancient opinions to the extent actually required by newly-ascertained data. In thus striving to re-state the traditional views, they plainly aim at securing more correct positions for scriptural science, and indeed positions in organic connection with ancient Biblical knowledge, so that, in all such cases, their desire of doing constructive work cannot reasonably be questioned. With regard to the amount of truth which may be embodied in recent theories their attitude is exactly the same. As a rule, they are willing to acknowledge as valid contributions to scriptural science the new positions which other critics may have established by hard and constant labor. Willingly too they

endeavor to strengthen or otherwise improve such positions in order that they may become more worthy and more lasting materials in the edifice of Biblical knowledge.

Another proof of the sincere desire on the part of the Higher Critics of the Bible to do constructive work is found in the fact that to further this object they do not recoil from the use of methods which may appear rash and venturesome in the eyes of many. We have particularly in view their manner of acting when they think that they do not possess sufficient evidence to pronounce definitely for or against a position. When this happens,—as for instance, when documents are lacking, or when those newly discovered have not yet been fully examined, etc.,—they oftentimes prefer to suggest probabilities, to put forth conjectures rather than to make merely negative statements. They know full well that such probabilities and conjectures are not in themselves positive elements of human science; that, in fact, they are liable to be pitilessly set aside after having been tested by other critics. But they know also that in offering them for what they are worth, they may indirectly contribute to the actual advance of critical knowledge by suggesting new problems or lines of thought, or at least by calling forth discussion.

Lastly, to remain convinced of the constructive object of the Higher Critics, one has only to take into consideration the vast literature which these scholars have put forth since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Year after year, and in ever increasing numbers, articles, pamphlets, monographs, commentaries, dictionaries, productions of all kinds and sizes, have appeared from their pens with the distinct purpose of enlarging or otherwise improving the field of scriptural science. It is indeed true that a fair amount of this enormous literary output has proved of little avail for building up the edifice of Biblical knowledge, and that a certain portion of it was unfortunately published with the real purpose of doing destructive work. But this fact should not surprise any one, for the students of the Higher Criticism of the Bible could not reasonably be expected to be all equally capable of contributing to the advance of that difficult branch of scriptural science, or equally unbiased in their treatment of its important problems. Still less should it lead one to treat as worthless all the works on Holy Writ published by the Higher Critics. The supposition that the incessant, painstaking labors of generations of acute and independent minds, deeply versed in Oriental customs and languages, and using the latest and best methods of critical in-

vestigation, have added nothing positive to ancient Biblical learning, can never appear otherwise than extremely improbable; nay, more, it must be deemed a pernicious apologetical error. The very tyro in recent Biblical literature knows that such a supposition is not true; and the scholars best acquainted with the leading productions of the Higher Critics know full well that if these works contain at times unsound theories, gratuitous assertions, venturesome views, each and all contribute valuable additions to Biblical linguistics, exegesis, literary and historical criticism, etc. This is the decided view of so able a writer as Bp. Le Camus, who, in the Preface to the sixth edition of his "Vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ," writes as follows: "A particularly patient and careful study of the text (of the Gospels) has led me to certain comparisons, combinations, and philological discussions which have a real value for the solution of certain difficulties. In this, I have followed not my own opinions solely: I have had to listen much to those of others. It cannot be denied that, along with many errors, as regrettable as they are surprising, the exegetes of the present day in Germany, England, America, and even in France, have succeeded in scrutinising the Gospels, let us say the Bible, from every point of view as no other book has ever been scrutinized and investigated. It was necessary to present these new and often ingenious explanations to the minds of those unacquainted with this very interesting literature. This is what I have attempted." This is also the solemn verdict of Pope Pius X., in his recent commendatory letter to the learned prelate just quoted, when he says: "You show by your example that there is nothing to be feared for the sacred books from the true progress of the art of criticism, nay, that a beneficial light may be derived from it, provided its use be coupled with a wise and prudent discernment."

Our conclusion is briefly this: To apply usually to the Higher Criticism of the Bible the contemptuous epithets of "negative" and "destructive" seems to us both unjust and misleading. Such a manner of acting betrays either ignorance or bad faith, if not indeed both the one and the other. The truth of the matter is that the students of the Higher Criticism have, as a body, aimed at reaching positive conclusions and doing constructive work, and that a large number among them have contributed much to the advance of true scriptural science.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

WAS APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY A CHURCH?*

Rt. Rev. Mgr. Pierre Batiffol

Christianity from the beginning, when, bursting forth from Jerusalem, it became a "Dispersion," appeared foreign to the idea of race distinction and emancipated from the authority of the Law. But at the same time, and this is more positive, it appeared as a society provided with a government; as a society embodying a spiritual unity and destined to replace the Chosen People; a society enjoying new privileges, being founded on Jesus Christ. Apostolic Christianity therefore contained within itself the essential characteristics of a church, and to prove this, point by point, is the object of the present paper.

I.

Tacitus has left us in the space of three or four lines his account of the origin of Christianity: "Christ, from whom the Christians derive their name, was put to death in the reign of Tiberius, by the governor Pontius Pilate. Although suppressed at the time, this execrable superstition broke out anew" (towards the year 64, under Nero) "not only in Judea, where it had its source, but even in Rome, where horrible and infamous practices coming from all regions find a home and adepts."[1]

It is not necessary to take in their rigorously strict sense these words of Tacitus, who, being an artistic genius, is prone in his composition to arrange facts with a view to scenic effect. He represents things here as if from the death of Christ to the burning of Rome in 64, Christianity had but passed through a long stage of suppression, and as if shortly before the year 64 it had taken a sudden expansion not only in Judea but also in Rome. But the truth is that Christianity appeared

---

* This article is a sequel to a previous one entitled: "Was Judaism a Church?" by the same writer, in the April-May number of The New York Review, 1906.

[1] "Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperatore per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat; repressaque in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat, non modo per Judaeam, originem ejus, sed per Urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque." Tacitus, *Annal.* xv, 44.

only towards the year 64 as distinct from Judaism and as a vast and powerful autonomous movement. Previous to that date Christianity which had spread to the Greek and Roman cities by means of their Jewish quarters, and to some extent under the ægis of the laws framed for the protection of Judaism, had been naturally more or less identified with the latter. Ambrosiaster, a Roman Christian writer who composed in Rome towards the year 380 a commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, gives evidence of possessing an exceptional knowledge or intuition of the conditions under which Christianity was introduced into Rome, when he represents it as penetrating at first by means of the Jewish colony and enjoying for a time the toleration and protection that the Roman law accorded to the Jews throughout the empire.

The same author is doubtless also right when he affirms that the first Roman Christians were observers of the Mosaic law—i. e., Christians who were not excluded from the Jewish people.[2]

Suetonius in his *Vita Claudii* records a fact which illustrates this confusion of the primitive Christians with the Jews. "Judæos impulsore Chresto adsidue tumultuantes Roma expulit."[3] The same is confirmed by a passage in the Acts (xviii, 2). St. Paul goes from Athens to Corinth, and there he meets with a Jewish Christian named Aquila, a native of Pontus, who had just come from Italy with Priscilla, his wife: "for," says the sacred writer, "Claudius had by an edict expelled all the Jews from Rome." We may safely fix the arrival of St. Paul in Corinth as occurring in the year 52. Claudius died in 54. The edict of expulsion may have been issued in 51 or 52. The only obscurity in the assertion of Suetonius is the mention of the instigator whom he calls "Chrestus." Some have taken the words as they stand and have supposed that a person called Chrestus (this name being quite common among slaves) had probably instigated a riot among his co-religionists. Others have thought that Suetonius, through a slight confusion, may have written "Chrestus" for "Christus." In this connection it may be noted that Tertullian reproaches the Romans of his time with a defective pronunciation, viz.: "Chres-

---

[2]"Constat temporibus apostolorum Judæos, propterea quod sub regno romano agerent, Romæ habitasse: ex quibus hi qui crediderant, tradiderunt Romanis ut Christum profitentes legem servarent. . . . Romanis autem irasci (Paulus) non debuit, sed et laudare fidem illorum; quia nulla insignia virtutum videntes nec aliquem apostolorum, susceperant fidem Christi ritu licet judaico." *In Rom. prolog.* (P. 4, t. xvii, p. 45-46).

[3]Suetonius, *Claud.*, 25.

tianus."[4] It is very likely that controversies arose in the Roman Jewries concerning "the author of the name "Christian, as the Acts show to have been the case in all the other Jewish colonies into which Christianity had penetrated. This interpretation seems more natural than to suppose that the disturbance of the Roman jewries was caused by some dispute concerning Messianism.[5]

If, therefore, as is generally admitted, the jewries in Rome were disturbed by the introduction of Christianity, "impulsore Chresto," the fact that Claudius re-established order by expelling the Jews from Rome, and the Christians along with them, as would appear from the case of Aquila and Priscilla—proves that the Roman authorities did not yet distinguish between Jews and Christians, or did not choose to take cognizance of the points whereby they were differentiated. Thus at Corinth, about the same time or shortly after, St. Paul was dragged by the Jews and the soldiers before the proconsul Annæus Novatus Gallio, brother of Seneca, and when he heard the Jews accuse Paul of being a renegade to the Law, he exclaimed: "If it be a question . . . of words and names and of your law, look ye to it, for I will be no judge in such matters," and he drove them from the judgment seat.[6]

But ten years later things were different. By that time the separation between the Christians and the Jews had been accomplished. This goes to show that in the meantime the recruits for Christianity were for the most part gentiles by birth, and moreover, that the Jews themselves, not satisfied with having obtained the revocation of the edict which had banished them from Rome under Claudius, had also profited by the favor which they enjoyed under Nero to forestall a recurrence of the misunderstanding which had cost them so dearly. In fact the events of the year 64 show that the confusion of Christians with Jews no longer existed.

On the 19th of July, A. D. 64, a conflagration broke out in Rome in the neighborhood of the Circus Maximus. The fire raged during six days and seven nights, destroying the Velabrum, the Forum and a part of the Palatine. Then it broke out anew at the other end of the city and for three days it ravaged the Quirinal, the Viminal and the Campus Martius. Out of a total of fourteen districts comprised within the city limits only four were spared, among these latter being

[4]Tertullian, *Apol*, 3: . . . "perperam Chrestianus pronuntiatur a vobis, nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos. . . ."

[5]See Sanday and Headlans, *Epistle to the Romans*, Edinburgh, 1895, p. xxi.

[6]Acts xviii, 12-17.

the sections (Porta Capena and Trastevere) where the Jews were the most numerous. In the distress and excitement following the calamity the people of Rome accused Nero of having burned the city in order that he might rebuild it on a new plan. To set aside this accusation the emperor, as Tacitus relates, "incriminated others, and caused the most exquisite tortures to be inflicted upon a class of men detested for their abominations and who were commonly known as Christians."[7]

Thus the Jews, though their quarters were among those that had suffered least, do not seem to have been at all suspected as the authors of the conflagration. But the accusation falls upon the Christians. These latter were therefore recognized as being distinct from the Jews. A few Christians were seized who made no secret of their profession; through these others were discovered until a vast multitude of them were incriminated. "Igitur primum correpti qui fatebantur, deinde, indicio eorum multitudo ingens haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis convicti sunt." The name "Christian" is known to the populace. Those who bear it are those "quos per flagitia invisos Christianos adpellabat." The name is odious, connected with crime and infamy; but the grievances alleged against them are not those which the people have harbored against the Jews. It is no longer question of hatred and persecution of a race easily recognized by its customs and physiognomy; it is a form of worship which is "confessed" (fatebantur), or which is betrayed (indicio). The Christians are a vast defenceless multitude, whereas the Jews exist apart, bearing the marks of their race and enjoying the protection accorded to it by the law.

Tacitus wrote about the year 115, but the principal source of his narrative dealing with the reign of Nero was a history of that reign composed by Cluvius Rufus in the time of Galba and Vespasian—between 68 and 79—but which is now lost.[8] If the fact of the persecution of the year 64 were not undeniable and rather significant, we may conjecture that Tacitus would have corroborated his statement concerning it by an appeal to his supposed source. His testimony with regard to it is confirmed by a passage which is supposed to have been taken from the lost portion of his *Historiæ* and which is found in the *Chronicon* of Sulpicius Severus. It is to this effect. In a council of war held by Titus on the 9th of August of the year 70 on the eve of

[7] Tacitus, *Annal.*, xv, 44.

[8] P. Fabia, *Les Sources de Tacite.* (Paris, 1873) p. 403.

the burning of the Temple of Jerusalem, the Roman general asks if the Temple should be destroyed. Several of his officers agree with him in thinking the moment opportune for its destruction, in order, they say, to suppress more completely the religion of the Jews and of the Christians. " . . . quo plenius judæorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur: quippe has religiones, licet contrarias sibi, iisdem tamen ab auctoribus profectas: Christianos ex Judæis extitisse: radice sublata, stirpem facile perituram."[9] Here again and with greater precision is affirmed together with the Jewish origin of Christianity, the distinction and opposition existing between the two religions.

Nor is that all, for not only was the distinction a matter of public notoriety, but it was also, we believe, recognized and sanctioned by the Roman legislation.[10]

* * *

It is beyond question that at the beginning of the second century the profession of Christianity was forbidden by the laws of the empire. This fact is known to us from the correspondence between Pliny the Younger and the Emperor Trajan. The former was the imperial legate to the province of Bithynia and Pontus from the Autumn of the year 111 to the Spring of 113. Hardly had he arrived at this governmental post than he had to take cognizance of legal prosecutions directed against the Christians. Strange to say, though having already fulfilled the position of lawyer, prætor and consul, it would seem that he had never had occasion to conduct a prosecution of this kind, indicating apparently that the attacks upon the Christians were local and intermittent. Be that as it may, in Bithynia and Pontus the flame of persecution had been kindled and a great number of persons were in danger. "A great number of persons," he says, "of every age, sex and condition are being legally prosecuted, or will be soon, for the contagion of this superstition has invaded not only the cities but also the villages and the country at large."[11] He had interrogated the accused Christians; he had put two deaconesses

[9]Sulp. Severus, *Chron.* II, 30. Cf. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, t. I, (Paris, 1906) p. 108.

[10]See article by M. C. Callemært, on the origin of the proscriptive legislation in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, t. II (1901) and t. III (1902). My own opinion which coincides with that of M. Callemært had been already set forth by me in the *Revue Biblique*, t. III (1894) p. 503-521).

[11]Plin. *Epistul.*, x, 96. Cf. E. Prenschen, *Analecta* (Freiburg 1893) p. 14-16. Concerning the authenticty of Pliny's letter and of Trajan's reply, see A. D'Alès, *Théologie de Tertullien*, (Paris, 1905, p. 379-380).

to the torture but without discovering any crime. "I found nothing," he continues, "but a bad, extravagant superstition." For his own part he would gladly consent to spare this superstition in which was mingled much that was good; he would willingly look upon it as inoffensive, or at least he opines that it would be more effectually overcome by the use of mild rather than severe measures. What then, can have caused him to take such severe action unless a law which forbade the profession of the superstition in question?

Here then, we find an indication of a legislation proscribing the practice of Christianity. "To those who were brought before me accused of being Christians," Pliny goes on to say, "I put the question: 'are you Christians?' Those who admitted the charge were brought before me for a second and even a third interrogation and threatened with the death penalty. If they persisted in their avowal I had them sent to execution." Thus we see that the avowal of Christianity was tantamount to the admission of a capital crime. This the legate declares still more explicitly, for he appears to be shocked by the severity of the penalties which he is called upon to inflict. He is perplexed to know if he should make a distinction of persons according to age, or if perhaps the matter is such as to admit of no distinction between tender youth and adult years; should pardon be granted in case of repentance, or was the offence of such a nature that once a person had become fully a Christian it could be of no avail to have retracted the "superstition?" Was it the name "Christian" *per se*, prescinding from all crime, that entailed the penalty, or was the punishment restricted to the crimes associated with the name? That the name came under the ban of the law is clear; the question was only to determine whether the name apart from the crimes connected with it, or the crimes themselves were the object of the legal proscription, and the fact of such a question is sufficient proof that the law had failed to make that distinction.

Pliny has misgivings about the application of a law so severe, but he applies it nevertheless. "Those who have denied that they were, or that they had been Christians, I have caused to be released, when following my lead they had invoked the gods and worshipped with incense and wine before the image of the emperor that I had brought with me expressly for that purpose together with the statues of the gods, and when they had moreover cursed Christ—things which, it is said, real Christians can never be forced to do." All this is simply a test procedure and a manner of determining the character of the

oath and interrogatory administered to the accused. They are pronounced guilty, not of having refused to offer incense and libations to the statues of the gods and of the emperor, but of being Christians, since their constancy in abstaining from these idolatrous acts is considered as an indication that they belong to the proscribed "superstition." What Pliny wishes to obtain is not that the accused persons conform to the received worship rendered to the gods and to the emperor, but that they cease to be Christians. "I think," he writes, "that it is possible to check this superstition and remedy the situation. For, it is already a noteworthy fact that the temples which had been well nigh abandoned, are again beginning to be frequented; the solemn feasts which had long been interrupted, are again being celebrated, and the flesh of the victims which for a long time past had found no buyers is again exposed for sale. From all this it is easy to infer what a multitude of people might be brought back if room were left for repentance."[12] Pliny would prefer preventive measures to drastic penalties, but the existing law did not allow him the liberty of exercising toleration. He will try to bring back the wavering ones by gentle means, but he will break the stubborn by a rigorous application of the law.

Trajan replying to this communication of his envoy says: "You have followed the proper course in the prosecution of the persons which have been brought before your tribunal charged with being Christians. In such matters there can be no fixed interpretation of the law that will cover all cases. The Christians should not be sought out (conquirendi non sunt), but if they are accused and convicted they must be punished. If, however, any should deny that they are Christians, and prove the same by their actions, viz.: by addressing supplications to the gods, let them be pardoned as a reward for their repentance, howsoever grave the suspicions that may have rested upon them beforehand."

This rescript of Trajan does not create the law; it is a commentary upon a law already in force. "They are not to be sought out," says the emperor, who thereby recommends on this head a mild interpretation of the law. "If accused and convicted, they are to be punished." This refers to the essential action of the law itself. The Christian religion is tolerated in the sense that it may be officially ignored or connived at, but in case of a denunciation the law to which appeal is made must be allowed to take its course. It is the deadly inheri-

[12]Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, t. I, p. 106.

tance of the Neronian legislation which has passed into the hands of the more humane Trajan. It is, indeed, the opinion of the present writer that the laws prohibiting the Christian religion go back to Nero, but is only fair to say that some eminent critics regard the matter as doubtful. On this point Mgr. Duchesne writes as follows: "At some date (prior to the reign of Trajan) the ruling powers must have decreed that to be a Christian was a crime punishable by law, but to determine the exact date of this enactment is no easy task. Two persecutions are generally reckoned anterior to Trajan, that of Nero and that of Domitian, but the principal facts reported in connection with these persecutions, viz.: the execution of Roman Christians falsely accused of being guilty of burning the city in the year 64, and the death of several persons of high rank whom Domitian caused to be done away with under the pretext that they were atheists, are facts of so particular a nature that they can be explained without assuming the existence of a law prohibiting the Christian religion. They might have occurred before any such law was passed, and are therefore of little avail in determining the date of its enactment."[13] Neither is it our intention to draw any conclusion from these facts any more than from the vague text of uncertain date contained in the First Epistle of St. Peter (iv, 15). Our opinion concerning the Neronian origin of the prohibitory law is grounded on other reasons.

Early Church history gives evidence, we believe, of a persistent reminiscence that Nero had in mind not merely to do away with the Apostles Peter and Paul and to persecute the Christians of Rome, but also to extinguish Christianity itself by making the profession thereof a capital crime. This reminiscence is recorded by Sulpicius Severus and by Orosius,[14] and still more clearly by Tertullian. Twice the latter writer asserts that Nero condemned the Christian name. "Principe Augusto hoc nomen ortum est. Tiberio disciplina ejus inluxit. Sub Nerone damnatio invaluit. . . . Quales simus, damnator ipse demonstravit . . . et tamen permansit evasis omnibus hoc solum institutum neronianum."[15] The word "institutum" in the language of Tertullian means law. In any case, it is question of a permanent prohibitive measure: "damnatio permansit." In another passage the same writer reminds us that the law proscribing

[13]Sulp. Severus, *Chron.* II, 28; Orosius, *Hist.* vii, 7. Cf. Treuschen, p. 10, 11.

[14]Tertull., *Ad nation.*, i, 7; D'Alès, *(op. cit.*, p. 384-389) after a thorough discussion of the problem arrives at a conclusion similar to our own.

[15]Tertull. *Apol.* 5.,

the Christians originated with Nero. "Consulite commentarios vestros. Illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc sectam cum maxime Romæ orientem cæsarino gladio ferocisse, (sed) tali dedicatore damnationis nostræ etiam gloriamur."[16]

The word "commentarii" stands here for the archives of the imperial cabinet, and as these archives were inaccessible sources, Tertullian's appeal to them is more rhetorical than practical. Elsewhere and in a more simple manner he mentions as his source of information the "Vitæ Cæsarum," probably those of Suetonius. At all events, there is an unmistakable allusion to a legalized, bloody persecution sanctioned by the authority of the emperor. Of this there is a still more convincing attestation—the earliest we possess—in the writings of Suetonius.

This historian (about the year 120) was not a psychological writer of history, nor had he the temperament of a tragedian, after the manner of Tacitus; he rather chronicled events with the precision and artless realism which we note in a table of contents. Now it is noteworthy that Suetonius, who is generally at great pains to enumerate all the important decisions and enactments of the emperors, the magistrates and the senate, fails to establish any connection between the persecution of the Christians under Nero and the burning of Rome in the year 64. This omission affords good ground for suspecting that the connection of the two events as recorded by Tacitus may have been only a clever conjecture put forth rather for dramatic effect than because of its ascertained reality. Furthermore, Suetonius relates that the Christians were punished with torture and death "because they practiced a new and maleficent eligion"—which assertion seems to embody not a literary conjecture but a juridical decision. Finally, a mention of the same fact appears in one of the enumerations of laws so common in the works of Suetonius. The law in question is not referred to as an illustration of Nero's cruelty; on the contrary it is reckoned among the good laws enacted by him —laws "new and severe," which were a credit to his reign because their object was reform and the safeguarding of public morality.

[16] "Multa sub eo (Nerone) et animadversa severe et coercita nec minus instituta: adhibitus sumptibus modus; publicæ cænæ ad sportulas redactæ; interdictum ne quid in popinis coqui præter legumina aut holera veniret, cum antea nullum non obsonii genus proponeretur; adflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ et maleficæ, vetiti quadrigariorum lusus, quibus inveterata licentia passim vagantibus fallere ac furari per jocum jus erat; pantomimarum factiones cum ipsis simul relegatæ; adversus falsarios. . . ." Suetonius, *Nero*, 16.

Thus are enumerated the law against luxury, the law against cabarets, the law against the Christians, the law against gambling, the law against clowns, the law against forgers, etc.[17] Whence it is plain that the prohibition of the Christian religion had been made the object of a special legislative enactment.

To sum up: the events of the year 64 go to show (1) that at that date Christianity was publicly recognized as distinct and separate from Judaism; (2) that the new religion, far from enjoying the protection legally accorded to the Jews—"Sub umbraculo insignissimæ religionis, certe licitæ"[18]—the new religion was the direct object of a vexatious prohibitory law enacted by Nero. This penal legislation constituted, as it were, the civil and political status of Christianity.

II.

Having severed its connection with Judaism during the first generation of its existence, Christianity could no more derive its organic unity from unity of race than from the observance of the Mosaic law which was regarded by Christians as having been abolished. Was the new religion therefore, without a unifying principle? Does it appear as an organization comprising a vaguely defined multitude, scattered and without bond of union like the proselytes in the looser sense, the φοβουμενοι τον θεον of the Jewish Dispersion? Can the diffusion of Christianity be assimilated to that of the Cynics with the only difference that its teachings and practices were loftier and more pure? If such were the case Christianity would be a mass without unity or cohesion, as powerless to propagate and perpetuate itself as were those sects which after the fashion of the Cynics swarmed in the cities of Greece and in Rome.[19]

Similar, likewise, would have been the result if incipient Christianity had been simply a spiritual movement of such a character as was, for instance, that of Montanism later on. It is well known that in the early Christian communities there was an extraordinary effusion of charisms or gifts of a supernatural character, or at least which appeared to be such. They are mentioned in many passages of the Acts. Thus the Spirit commands, the Spirit

[17]Tertull., *Apol.*, 21.

[18]"Non licet esse Christianos." Cf. D'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 387.

[19]See Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii, 50, where Celsus agrees with Origen in calling attention to the multitude of Cynic and other propagandists to be met with in all the public places. Cf. Acts xvii, 17 seqq.

prophesies, the Spirit is manifested in visions, in dreams, in ecstasies, in prayers, in song; the Spirit is diffused by means of strange and inexplicable graces such as the gift of tongues, etc.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews recalls in retrospect the primitive Christian preaching as being founded on the testimony of those who had seen the Lord, but also on the co-operation of God who confirmed their testimony by "signs and wonders and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost according to his own will" (Heb. ii, 3-4). It is nevertheless an indubitable fact that Christianity was so constituted that of itself it was bound to react against the sensational effects of these extraordinary gifts. That St. Paul believed in the co-operation of the Holy Spirit with him in his apostolate, and in the reality of the action of the Spirit as displayed in the charisms there can assuredly be no doubt; yet he does not consider these extraordinary manifestations as supreme and unquestionable. On the contrary, he holds them to be subordinate to two principles, viz.: in the first place, to the received authentic faith, and secondly, to the interests of the general edification.[20] "But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be anathema" (Gal. i, 8); and again: "Wherefore I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus anathema" (I Cor. xii, 3).[21] The entire instruction of St. Paul to the Corinthians concerning the gifts of the Spirit might here be recalled as pertinent to the matter in hand (I Cor. xii,1-xiv, 40). He exhorts the Christians of Corinth to aspire after the gifts of the Spirit especially that of prophecy. He seems to have some misgivings concerning the irregularities and unintelligibility connected with the gift of tongues. The man who has the gift of prophecy speaks to men, is understood by them; he edifies, encourages and consoles them, whilst nobody understands the believer who speaks with tongues. One would almost say that the sturdy good sense of St. Paul cared little for these extraordinary and sterile manifestations.

"But now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, unless I speak to you either by way of revelation, or of knowledge, or of prophesying, or of teaching? Even things without life, giving a voice, whether pipe or harp, if they give not a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain voice who shall prepare himself for war? So

[20]See H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des Heilgen Geistes* (Gottingen, 1899) p. 66-71.
[21]Cf. II Thess., ii, 15.

:also ye, unless ye utter by the tongue speech easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye will be speaking into the air. There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and no kind is without signification. If then I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh will be a barbarian unto me. So also ye, since ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may abound unto the edifying of the church. Wherefore let him that speaketh in a tongue pray that he may interpret. For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. . . . I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all: howbeit in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue. . . . If therefore the whole church be assembled together and all speak with tongues, and there come in men unlearned or unbelieving, will they not say that ye are mad? . . . What is it then, brethren? When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying . . . for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace. . . . If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord." (I Cor. xiv.)

Notwithstanding the spontaneous manifestation of the Spirit the Apostle proclaims the rights of an authority whose business it is to maintain order and safeguard the faith once received, for God is not the author of confusion but of peace.

Christianity is not, therefore, primarily a religion of enthusiasm, but neither is it exclusively a religion of charity. Caution is here necessary to avoid mistaking the effect for the cause, the fruit for the tree.

It is right to attach great importance to the social solidarity which Christianity established between its adherents. The sympathy and help that every Jew was sure to find in any jewry was assured in each Christian community to every Christian believer. Few of the Gospel sayings found a more responsive echo in the early Christian consciousness than the logion: "I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was hirsty, and ye gave me to drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me n; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me" (Matt. xxv, 35 seq.) Nothing in Christianity was more striking to the eyes of the pagan onlookers than the mutual love of the brethren.[22] And it has justly been observed that the tendency to solidarity was not a casual phenomenon in the development of Christianity, but rather an essential element, for the new religion had from the outset taken the form of a brotherhood.[23] It had inherited from Judaism a religious esteem for alms-

[22]Lucian., *Peregrin.*, 13.

[23]I Thess. iv, 9-10; Rom. xii, 10.

giving. The story of Tabitha in the Acts (ix, 36-43) is a Christian parallel to that of Tobias, and, as it were, a commentary on the words: "Alms deliver from all sin and from death." (Tob. iv, 11). This spirit of almsgiving is free from all trace of communism, since it is considered desirable that each one have the means of giving something to the needy, not only for the merit and spiritual benefit accruing therefrom, but also for the happiness that results from such acts of charity (Acts xx, 33-35). Christian almsgiving which was practiced primarily with regard to the needy among the faithful (Gal. vi, 10), took on a twofold form, viz. hospitality φιλοξενια which consisted in receiving and entertaining the brethren who chanced to pass,[24] and generous donations for the relief of the poor together with concerted action for the same purpose κοινωνια. By means of a regular organized system alms were collected for the needs of the indigent belonging to each local community, for the support of missionaries and for the relief of distant communities when in distress. Each Christian congregation seems to have had a common fund to which the faithful contributed every Sunday according to their means (I Cor. xiv, 1-2). The Christian community of Philippi in Macedonia is represented as having, as it were, a perpetual fund open to St. Paul for the needs of his missionary journeys (Philipp. iv, 15-16). Such duties were incumbent on the wealthier communities. Thus St. Pual writing to the Romans exhorts them to be steadfast in prayer, to relieve the necessities of the saints and to exercise hospitality (Rom. xii, 12-13).[25] We are told likewise that the Christians of Jerusalem being in distress were relieved by means of voluntary contributions from the various rich communities among the Gentiles.[26] Between the different congregations there was a constant interchange of guests, missionaries and pecuniary help, as also of friendly counsel and the various other means of mutual edification. Professor Harnack referring to the testimony of the Ignatian letters writes as follows, and his observations would be just as true if applied to the Christianity of the time of St. Paul. "What a continuity of mutual friendly relations between the different communities! Truly they were of one heart and soul and animated for one another with a true fraternal solicitude. The material assistance rendered in this connection fades into insignificance

[24]Cf. Rom. xvi, 1-2 and 23.

[25]Cf. Heb. xiii, 1 3 and 16; I Pet. iv, 8-9.

[26]Rom. xv, 25-28; II Cor., viii 1–xi, 15; Gal. ii, 10; Acts xi, 17 30. In Jerusalem the wealth was in the hands of the Saducees while Christianity was recruited among the poorest classes whence the name "Ebionites" given to the Christians.

in presence of the evidences of the intimate solidarity existing as a bond of union between the different communities taken as a whole . . . a spirit which led them to console and help one another, to share mutually their joys and sorrows. Thus is revealed to us a new world of solidarity and brotherly love."[27] But needless to say, this mutual love is a result, a fruit of something else. The root of such a sentiment cannot be identified with the sentiment itself. This root is the Christian faith of which the sentiment is but the practical manifestation. The main spring therefore of the unity of Christianity is not to be sought in the social solidarity by which it was so strongly characterized.

* * *

Should the basis of this unity be sought in the community organization which prevailed in Christianity from the beginning? Historians have been not a little inclined, as by degrees more became known concerning the pagan *collegia*, to represent the Christian communities as associations organized after the same fashion. This assimilation of one to the other, it was thought, might perhaps help to explain the formation of Christianity into a church! As a matter of fact, the alleged resemblance disappears when subjected to critical observation.[28] It is to be remarked that Christianity separated itself from the jewries. But these latter were organized on community lines without having anything in common with the *collegia*; they existed by virtue of a legal regime quite different from that of the *collegia*. The Christian communities were formed under the ægis of the legal protection accorded to the Jews. When this protection was withdrawn the Christians would doubtless have organized themselves under the regime of the *collegia*, but it was then too late and such a legislation was no longer possible.

The question came up in the third century in connection with the legal status of ecclesiastical property, as the Church was already in possession of the cemeteries and the places of worship, and there can be no doubt that this right of ownership was legally recognized at least as early as the time of Alexander Severus (222-235), perhaps even from the end of the second century.[29] "Poor people were allowed to organize in groups with a view to provide for themselves a decent

[27]Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung* (Leipzig, 1902) p. 141-142.
[28]See R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht* (Leipzig, 1892) p 75-77.
[29]Cf. Duchesne, *Hist. ancienne*, t. I, p. 383-384.

burial. These burial associations could collect monthly dues, possess property, hold meetings of a religious character, and they were represented by an *actor* or agent empowered to do business in the name of the association. The inscriptions prove that such associations existed in great numbers throughout the empire. There seems to be no valid reason why groups of Christians should not have been allowed to share in these privileges."[30] De Rossi sought to explain by this supposed adoption by the Christians of the legal status accorded to the burial associations, the fact of recognized ecclesiastical ownership in the third century, but his theory has not been generally accepted, not even for the third century when the legislation governing the burial associations had become more elastic and lenient. How indeed, it is justly asked, could Christianity which was a universal religion conceal itself under the mask of these little associations? Who would have been deceived by the subterfuge? How could the Christian worship with its regular meeting on Sundays, and even more often during the week, be shielded by a legislation which allowed the burial associations to hold meetings only once a month? How could the Christian who was received as a brother in all the churches make his status square with the law prohibiting membership in more than one burial association?[31] The theory is still less satisfactory for the first two centuries, for during that period the laws referring to the associations were extremely rigorous. The formation of an unauthorized society was then regarded as a crime,[32] and in order to be legally recognized, an association needed the sovereign fiat of the emperor. We can hardly suppose that such an authorization was ever sought by any of the Christian congregations. It is even doubtful if they could have obtained it even if they tried, for it is hard to see how Christianity

[30]Ibid. See F. Girard, *Textes de droit romain* (Paris, 1895), p. 775-779.

[31]Marcian. *Institut.*, lib. III (*Digest.* lib. xlvii, Tit. xxii, § 1): "Mandatis principalibus præcipitur præsidibus provinciarum, ne patiantur esse collegia sodalia neve milites collegia in castris habeant. Sed permittitur tenuioribus stipe menstruam conferre, dum tamen semel in mense coeant, ne sub prætextu hujusmodi illicitum collegium coeat. Quod non tantum in Urbe, sed et in Italia et in provinciis locum habere divus quoque Severus rescripsit. Sed religionis causa coire non prohibentur, dum tamen per hoc non fit contra senatus consult um, quo illicita collegia arcentur. Non licet autem amplius quam unum collegium licitum habere, ut est constitutum et a divis patribus: et si quis in duobus fuerit, rescriptum est eligere eum oportere, in quo magis esse velit. . . ." O. Lenel, *Palingenesis Juris Civilis, Juris Consultorum reliquiæ*. t. I (Leipzig, 1889), p. 194.

[32]Ulpian. *De Officiis Proconsul.*, lib. vi (*Digest.* lib. xlvii, tit. xxii, § 2): "Quisquis illicitum collegium usurpaverit, ea pæna tenetur, qua tenentur qui hominibus armatis loca publica vel templa occupasse judicati sunt." Cf. Lenel, t. II, p. 972.

could be authorized as a burial association since it was proscribed as a religion.[33] We shall not therefore try to conceive of the Christian congregations as having the form and legal status of a *collegium*, or Christianity in general as a federation of such particular associations, for Christianity, according to all the available evidence, appeared not under the guise of a multitude of *collegia*, but simply and solely as a religion. But it was of the essence of that religion to establish a bond of unity between its members.[34]

We may therefore recall in concluding that Christianity though disengaged from Judaism and emancipated from the race idea, appears nevertheless endowed with a strong religious unity. This feature can neither be accounted for by the action of the Spirit manifesting itself in the extraordinary gifts, nor by the mutual love which produced social solidarity among the early Christians, nor in fine, by an alleged legal organization, viz.: one after the fashion of the *collegia*. The root principle of this unity characteristic of a church must be sought elsewhere.

PIERRE BATIFFOL.

[33]Gaius, lib. III, *ad edictum provinciale* (*Digest.* lib. III, tit. IV, § 1): "Neque societas neque collegium neque hujusmodi corpus passim omnibus habere conceditur: nam et legibus et senatus consultis et principalibus constitutionibus ea res coercetur. Paucis admodum in causis concessa sunt hujusmodi corpora: ut ecce vectigalium publicorum sociis permissum est corpus habere vel auri-fodinarum, vel argenti-fodinarum et salinarum. Item collegia Romæ certa sunt, quorum corpus senatus consultis atque constitutionibus principalibus confirmatum est, veluti pistorum et quorumdam aliorum, et naviculariorum, qui et in provinciis sunt. Quibus autem permissum est corpus habere collegii societatis sive cujusque alterius eorum nomine, proprium est ad exemplum reipublicæ habere res communes arcam communem et actorem sive syndicum, per quem tanquam in republica, quod communiter agi fierique oporteat, agatur fiat. . . ." Lenel, t. I, p. 194.

[34]"Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis et disciplinæ unitate et spei foedere", wrote Tertullian about the year 200 (*Apol.*, 39) using the word "corpus" in the juridical sense of association.

THE BIBLE AND THE ANCIENT EAST*

Gabriel Oussani, D. D.

In the remarkable progress of human knowledge in every branch of learning during the last half century, no science can claim to have made greater strides than Ancient History, with its sister branch, Archeology. It is not too much to say that the penetrating spirit and assiduous labors of our modern Historians, Archeologists, Explorers, Travellers, Decipherers and Philologists have succeeded in scoring one of the most brilliant successes that lie to the credit of the human intellect. The history of progress in this department of Ancient History and Archeology is a peculiar one. As Hilprecht says: "It is a history so full of dramatic effects and genuine surprises, and at the same time so unique and far reaching in its results and bearings, that it will always read more like a thrilling romance penned by the skillful hand of a gifted writer endowed with an extraordinary power of imagination than like a plain and sober presentation of actual facts and events."[1]

The historical researches into the early historic and pre-historic periods of Greece, Asia Minor, Italy and Rome, as well as the archeological discoveries made at Hissarlik, Mycenæ, Tiryns the Argive Heræum, Gnossos, Carthage, Cyprus and Rome are too well known to be here described; and the names of Schliemann, Monmsen, Evans, di Cesnola, Perrot and Chipiez, Reinach, Boissier, Boni and others are associated with some of the most startling and romantic discoveries of the second half of the nineteenth century.

But even more thrilling and more fascinating have been the archeological discoveries made in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Media and Persia, Palestine, Syria, Arabia, Phoenicia, and the land of the Hittites. These have so completely revolutionized our knowledge of the ancient East that it is no exaggeration to say that new worlds, which had disappeared from the scene of history for more than twenty-

*This article is a condensation of the author's inaugural lecture in his course of Oriental History and Biblical Archeology at Dunwoodie Seminary.

[1] *Explorations in Bible Lands during the Nineteenth Century.* Philadelphia, 1903. p. 3.

five centuries, and had been entirely forgotten, have been brought back to our view in all their ancient majesty.

Centuries before Greece or Rome attained any political or literary importance, these West-Asiatic empires had already ended their brilliant political, social and literary career. When Rome was but an infant, Ninive had already disappeared from the face of the earth; Babylon was doomed; Pithom, Thebes and Memphis demolished; Tyre and Sidon eclipsed; Carkemish ruined and forgotten; Jerusalem desolated; Damascus and Lachish destroyed,—not to speak of the still older centers of civilization of Southern Babylonia, such as Ur, Nippur, Shurgal, Tello, Larsa, Sippara, and Lagash, where mighty kings once held their sway. All these glorious nations were dead for us. All that was left of their former glory lay buried for thousands of years under the fertile soil of those immortal oases and wadies which once resounded with their mighty exploits, and from which civilization and arts, science and inventions, law and ethics, religion and morals originated and spread to the utmost parts of the Earth.

It was reserved to the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth to disinter from the deepest strata of mounds and ruins the impressive remains of those forgotten West-Asiatic peoples. Their capitals and cities, temples and palaces, schools and libraries have been found and excavated, and their historical records and inscriptions deciphered and studied by a legion of competent Occidental scholars and archeologists.

Up to the middle of the nineteenth century, little or nothing was known of these ancient civilizations. The very little we knew about them had come down to us either in legendary form or in vague and popular traditions handed down by a few unreliable Persian, Greek and Roman writers. The isolated allusions scattered in some of the historical and prophetical books of the Old Testament were meagre and unsatisfactory. To-day, however, thanks to the efforts of our modern scholars and archeologists, we are well acquainted with the history, chronology, religion, mythology, languages, literatures, arts and civilization of the ancient Egyptians, Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Elamites, Old Persians, Hittites, Israelites, Aramæans and the numerous Canaanitish tribes, Phœnicians, Ancient Arabs and a number of other minor tribes which once made their power felt over the historical lands of Western Asia. With their contemporary monuments and records at our disposal we can penetrate into the most obscure periods of their history; and, in many cases, we are

furnished with such an abundance of materials as to enable us to write their history with far more accuracy and certainty than the primitive history of Greece and Rome, or even of some periods of medieval Europe.

"The nineteenth century," to conclude with the words of Dr. Price, of Chicago, "has been really the century of romance—romance in exploration, in discovery, in invention, in thought, in science, in art and in life. The achievements of man have far exceeded the most sanguine dreams of the forefathers. We have not only made but discovered vast periods of history, and history has receded by discoveries through a period of more than four thousand years before the Christian era. This history has been dug out of mounds, tombs and pyramids. It has been found written on granite, alabaster, wood, clay, and papyrus. It has been read and translated from tablets, rolls, cylinders, statues, obelisques, mummies and inscriptions, and through a series of marvellous discoveries and romantic events we have been let into the secrets of wonderful centuries of hitherto unknown peoples and events."[2]

The Connection Between Oriental Archeology and the Old Testament.

These archeological discoveries, apart from their intrinsic value as trustworthy sources for the reconstruction and study of the history, languages, religion, literature and civilization of the ancient East, possess a special interest for the student of the Bible; and in this capacity they strongly appeal to all earnest students of religion.

Here the question naturally suggests itself: how is Oriental Archeology associated with the study of the Bible? The question is a fair one, and the answer to it simple; for even a superficial glance at the contents of the Old Testament will show the existence of this close relation. The connection between Oriental Archeology and the Old Testament rests mainly on the fact that Hebrew revelation or literature is, after all, a literature distinctly Oriental, both in form and contents, and, consequently, so remote from our modern and Western types and ideals that even the most elaborate and ingenious efforts to grasp it fall short of the objective unless we study it in the light of other ancient and modern Oriental literatures. Hebrew literature is a literature intensely human and universal; for it contains history, biography, geography, popular traditions, legislations, ceremonial institutions, ethical teaching and a manifold national and religious poetry. But all these literary and religious productions are conceived and presented in such a way, and from such special historical, religious, and literary points of view, that were we to measure

[2] *The Monuments and the Old Testament.* Chicago, 1902. 3d edit. p. 17.

and interpret them according to our own modern standards and ideals we should completely fail in estimating their real character and contents. Oriental Archeology, therefore, together with the study of the other Semitic languages and literatures, which are akin to those of the Old Testament writings, will furnish us with the only real key for the correct interpretation of the latter, and will provide us with invaluable aids for fully grasping their true nature and significance. Moreover, the literature of the Old Testament deals with tribes and peoples who are not only closely related to the Biblical people in race, language and civilization, but who have played also a great part in the history of the Ancient Eastern World.

"Now these tribes and nations," as Prof. MacCurdy remarks, "lived their lives and played their parts in a definite, restricted portion of the Orient. These are '*the Bible lands*'—the arena upon which the God of History, of Providence and of Redemption especially displayed His power and grace. The great primary revelation of His dealings with men is embodied, of course, in the Hebrew literature. These Bible lands, thanks to the wonderful and unexpected modern excavations and discoveries, have yielded to us a secondary revelation. It is subordinate, indeed, to the first, but it is richly supplementary and illustrative. It is the province of Oriental Archeology to deal with the people, countries and languages of the Bible so as to bring out their true relations to Bible teaching. They were formerly regarded as the mere framework of the picture. Now we are learning that they make up its groundwork, its coloring and its perspective. They embrace, in a word, what is material in the revelation, apart from what is spiritual and ideal. And these elements, the outward and the inward, are to us inseparable, as they were in their evolution mutually involved and interwoven."[3]

And first of all we must not forget the fact that the Hebrews were a sister-nation of the Assyro-Babylonians, Arabs, Aramæans and other tribes of Western Asia. Their blood-kinship can be fairly demonstrated on ethnographical and linguistic grounds. This is also clearly attested by the author of the tenth chapter of Genesis,[4] whose gene-

[3] *Oriental Research and the Bible* in Hilprecht's *Recent Research in Bible Lands*. Philadelphia, 1897. pp. 4, 5.

[4] Cf. Dillmann's *Commentary on Genesis*. English translation, Edinburgh, 1897. Vol. I, pp. 319 ff; and Delitzsch's Commentary, (Eng. transl.) Vol. I. pp, 303 ff. Mitchell, *The World Before Abraham* Boston, 1901. pp. 264-5. W. Wade, *Old Testament History*, London, 2d edit. 1903. pp. 63 ff. Driver, *Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, London, 1904. pp. 112-114. Lenormant, F., *Les Origines de l'histoire, etc.* Paris, 1882. Part II. pp. 316 ff. (Eng. tr. by Dr. F. Brown. New York, 1884). Nöldeke, *Semitische Sprache*. Leipzig, 2d edit. 1899. p. 3; and his article "Semitic Languages," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th edit. Vol. XXI, p. 673; W. Wright, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*. Cambridge, 1890. pp. 3, 4. Cf. also Gunkel and Hölzinger's Commentaries on Genesis in the Nowack and Marti series respectively, *ad locum*.

alogical table of the nations, although based in the main on geographical and political considerations rather than on historical or ethnographical principles, may nevertheless be accepted as correct in its ascription of a common ancestral relationship to these Semitic nations. Consequently our modern researches and investigations into the origins, migrations, national formation, and primitive social and religious organization of the early Semites, based on modern archeological discoveries, are of paramount importance for the correct understanding of the primitive history of the Hebrews.

On linguistic grounds their mutual relation is no less close and important. The language of the Hebrews and of the Old Testament writings in general is a sister branch of that group of languages which, from the time of Eichhorn,[5] have been generally called Semitic; and which were spoken by the Assyro-Babylonians, Aramæans, Phoenicians, Canaanites, Arabs and others. Consequently our modern researches into the origin, formation and development of the Semitic languages based on modern archeological discoveries, have a direct bearing on the proper understanding of the language of the Old Testament. Assyrian, South-Arabian, Phœnician and Aramæan philology has immensely facilitated the study of Hebrew, and solved many of its difficulties both in grammar and diction.[6] Many Hebrew words occur but once in the Old Testament; some indeed not at all; while

[5]Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, p. 673. Contrast Prof. Toy's note in Dr. Murray's *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Psalter*, New York, 1880, where he remarks that "A. L. Schlözer in his article on the Chaldeans in Eichhorn's *Repertorium für biblische und morgenlandische litteratur*, Part 8, p. 161 (1781) seems to speak of the term 'Shemitic' as if he were its inventor, and its use in that article is the earliest, so far as appears. But Eichhorn himself in his *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen litteratur*, vi. 772 (1794), claims to have been the first to substitute 'Shemitic' for 'Oriental' (the previous designation of these languages), and he must have known of Schlözer's use of it. It was through Eichhorn that the term gained currency." pp. 1, 2.

[6]Cf. Delitzsch Frd, *The Hebrew Language Viewed in the Light of Assyrian Research*, London, 1883. *Prolegomena eines neuen heb-aram. Worterbuchs zum A. T.* Leipzig, 1886. *Assyrische Grammatik*, Berlin, 1889, (a second edition is just out); and his *Babel and Bible*, Eng. tr., pp. 29, 30; Boscawen, *The Bible and the Monuments*, London, 1895, pp. 17-36; Evette, *New Light on the Bible and the Holy Land*, New York, 1892, pp. 444 ff.; Haupt, P., "Assyrian Phonology" in *Hebraica*, Chicago, 1885, Vol. I, p. 3; and especially H. Zimmern in the 3d edition of Dr. Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, Leipzig, 1903; as well as Dr. Buhl's last edition of Gesenius' *Hebraische Worterbuch*; and Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (based on that of Gesenius), Oxford and Boston, 1891 ff. cf. also F. Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition, passim*, New York, 1897; and his *Südarabische Chrestomathie*, Munich, 1893; also the several publications of Mordtmann, Winckler, D. H. Müller, Weber, Halévy, Prætorius, Littmann, and Ed. Glaser on the South-Arabian inscriptions and Sabean philology.

a great number of others have come down to us through the often misleading vocalization of the Massoretes. Their meaning had to be ascertained by a long, painful, and often unsuccessful comparative process. Now, however, the correct meaning of many of them has been ascertained by the discovery in some one of the newly discovered cognate Semitic languages of those words in scores or hundreds of connections. This fact, especially from the side of the Assyro-Babylonian language, the extent of whose vocabulary is not yet measured, gives great assistance in the linguistic study of the Old Testament. The significance, too, of the proper names of the Old Testament, which, as Lagarde, Hommel, Nöldeke, Winckler, Cheyne, Gray and others have shown, throw such light on the religious evolution of Israel, is greatly enhanced by these linguistic additions to our knowledge.[7] And in general it must ever be borne in mind that the correct understanding of the Old Testament rests mainly, though not solely, on the correct understanding of the grammar, syntax and vocabulary of the language in which it is written.

The history of the Hebrew people, the geography of its land and territories are also inseparably connected with those of the peoples of Western Asia and of their Semitic brethren in particular. Palestine, the home of the Hebrew people, was situated in the most central portion of Western Asia. On the southwest were the dwellers of the Nile, the inhabitants of an illustrious land which had long led the van of civilization; on the northwest, bound to them by common blood and speech, were the sea-traders of the ancient world, the Phœnicians; to the northeast were located their brethren, the Syrians, the land-traders of antiquity; while on the northeast were the two powerful empires of Assyria and Babylonia. Israel's promised land was consequently the centre of gravitation of the ancient Eastern world. Canaan was the bridge uniting the two continents of Asia and Africa; on every side and through her ran the great highways of the nations. On the south lay the trans-desert road from Egypt, through Petra and Duma to the Persian Gulf, and on the East, the caravan route, as

[7]Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition, passim.* Nöldeke-Kautsche-Gray-Cheyne's classical article "Names" in Vol. III of the *Encyclopædia Biblica.* Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names,* London, 1896. Jacobs, *Studies in Biblical Archeology,* London, 1894, ch. 4 and 5. Nöldeke in *Z. D. M. G.*, 1886, pp. 148-157; 1888, pp. 470-487. M. Jastrow, in the *Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis,* 1894, pp. 19 ff; 101-127; 1900, pp. 82-105. Stade in *ZATW.*, 1885, pp. 175-185; and the important contributions on the subject by Von Gall, Winckler, Hommel, Cheyne, Sayce, Lidzbarski, Lagarde and others.

to-day, from Damascus to the Red Sea and Arabia; up along the coast plains went the caravans from Egypt to Phœnicia and the North; another branch of this great coast road, cutting across the southeastern end of Mount Carmel and the plain of Esdraelon, reached Damascus and Assyria and Babylonia beyond.[8]

Not far from her and almost within reach of her borders took place the most memorable events of ancient history. Wars and conquests, military expeditions and sieges, famous campaigns and battles, political revolutions and struggles, the formation, rise and passing of empires were constantly witnessed by the descendants of Abraham, who were often dragged into these political struggles and made the scapegoat of the conquerors' wrath. It is true that in their earlier days the Hebrews enjoyed a most remarkable seclusion which was necessary for the development of their national and religious life. But when this had been realized, they were thrown by virtue of their location and spirit of national independence into the tempestuous stream of wars, seditions and struggles. Thus their history became so closely interwoven with that of Western Asia, as to form an integral part of it.

The Old Testament is, in the full meaning of the word, a history; and a history of so deep and enduring a significance that it has no equal. Even the prophetical narratives which abound in these complex Hebrew literary compositions, are cast in an historical framework which must be carefully examined if one would discover their true significance. Indeed, until their historical setting has been determined, it is very difficult to understand them properly. Those early Hebrew ecclesiastical statesmen and reformers, whom we are now accustomed to call by the rather misleading term "prophets," held in their hands for many centuries the fortunes of the Hebrew race. The part which they played, directly or indirectly, in the destiny of their own as well in that of neighboring nations is indeed a striking one. There is scarcely a phase of religious or social life in the history of the Israelites which has not been in one way or another influenced by the active ministry of these Hebrew prophets, whose idea of a universal kingdom under a supreme theocratic government has so deeply influenced their successors in the Jewish Synagogue and in the Christian Church.

[8]Cf. the very pertinent remarks on the subject by G. A. Smith in his *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 10th edit., New York, 1903, ch. I, pp. 1-43. Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*, London, 1895, pp. 15-35.

The history of the Jewish people is closely bound up in a great variety of ways with that of the other peoples of Western Asia. No other nation has been so distinctly unwarlike as the Hebrews; yet no other nation has played a more prominent part on the world-stage of history. The Hebrew historians tell us their side of these international events; they looked at them from their own point of view, and gave them their own religious interpretation. But the monuments of Egypt, of Assyria, of Babylonia, of Moab, and of the nations of Western Asia give us a version of these same events from a different viewpoint, and in a more concise and documentary form. Placed side by side, these parallel narratives form one of the most important subjects for historical investigation; many features of which have already been satisfactorily explained by the critical study of the Old Testament and of the archeological discoveries of the ancient Eastern world.

This community of blood, of origin, of speech, and of historical and political association between the Hebrew people and those of Western Asia involves a community of religious and social organization and ideas. The social and religious life of the ancient Hebrews must have shared in great measure the same phases and the same stages of evolution as those of the surrounding nations. Consequently, we must expect to find in all of them the common traits which have been so prominently brought out by the archeological discoveries in Bible lands. This, of course, does not exclude supernatural co-operation in the development of the religion of Israel. But we cannot overlook or underrate the human elements of race, temperament, speech, traditions, and primitive religious and ethical ideas; and these the Jews shared in common with the other West-Asiatic peoples.

It will thus be seen that Oriental Archeology has to do with the Old Testament in all its aspects; namely, as religion, history and literature.

The permanent and beneficial effects which Assyriology, Egyptology, and the other branches of Oriental Archeology have produced in the correct understanding of the Hebrew History and Literature have been admirably set forth by Dr. Driver, in his learned essay on "Hebrew Authority."

"The general result of the archeological and anthropological researches of the past half-century has been to take the Hebrews out of the isolated position which, as a nation, they seemed previously to hold, and to demon-

strate their affinities with, and often their dependence upon, the civilizations by which they were surrounded. Tribes more or less closely akin to themselves in both language and race were their neighbors alike on the north, on the east and on the south; in addition to this, on each side there towered above them an ancient and imposing civilization,—that of Babylonia, from the earliest times active, enterprising, and full of life; and that of Egypt, hardly if at all, less remarkable than that of Babylonia, though more self contained and less expansive. The civilization which, in spite of the long residence of the Israelites in Egypt, left its mark, however, most distinctly upon the culture and literature of the Hebrews was that of Babylonia. It was in the East that the Hebrew traditions placed both the cradle of humanity and the more immediate home of their own ancestors; and it was Babylonia which, as we now know, exerted during many centuries an influence, once unsuspected, over Palestine itself.

It is true, the facts thus disclosed do not in any degree detract from that religious pre-eminence which has always been deemed the inalienable characteristic of the Hebrew race: the spiritual intuitions and experiences of its great teachers retain still their uniqueness; but the secular institutions of the nation, and even the material elements upon which the religious system of the Israelites was itself constructed, are seen now to have been in many cases common to them with their neighbors. Thus their beliefs about the origin and early history of the world, their social usages, their code of criminal and civil law, their religious institutions, can no longer be viewed, as was once possible, as differing in kind from those of other nations, and determined in every feature by a direct revelation from Heaven; all, it is now known, have substantial analogies among other peoples, the distinctive character which they exhibit among the Hebrews consisting in the spirit with which they are infused and the higher principles of which they are made the exponent. Their literature, moreover, was not exempt from the conditions to which the literature of other nations was subject; it embraces, for instance, narratives relating to what we should term the pre-historic age, similar in character and scope to those occurring in the literature of other countries. There are many representations and statements in the Old Testament which only appear in their proper perspective when viewed in the light thrown upon them by archeology. And in some cases, as will be seen, it is not possible to resist the conclusion that they must be interpreted in a different sense from that in which past generations have commonly understood them."[9]

Oriental Archeology as a Science: Its Object and Limits.

Archeology is sometimes defined as "the science of all the human past." According to this definition, all documents, literary or material, all products of human activity, all relics of bygone generations, everything on which man has set his impress, should belong to the archeologist's field of investigation, his end being to reconstitute the history of the past, the evolution of the human race in all its varied activities.[10]

[9]In D. G. Hogarth's *Authority and Archeology Sacred and Profane*, London, 2d edit., 1899, pp. 6-8.

[10]D. G. Hogarth, *op. cit.*, pp. vi-vii.

But this definition embraces too much, and leaves too small a function to History. It has been justly observed that if the archeologist is to have for his part, not only the work of discovering, deciphering, and comparing the documents of the past, but also that of picturing the society of which they are the product, nothing is left for the historian to do. Consequently, it will be better to restrict the function of archeology to the study of the material documents, leaving their literary treatment, interpretation, etc., to the historian. Thus archeology can be aptly defined as "the science which treats of the material remains of man's past."[11]

The initial work of the archeologist, then, is that of seeking after the material remains of the past, and this consists mainly in systematic explorations and excavations. Such work necessarily presupposes a vast and extensive knowledge of history and geography. Besides, it requires a practical skill in handling and directing the material work of digging and unearthing mounds and ruins.[12] As models of this type of scientific explorers we may mention men like Layard, Schliemann, Evans, Mariette, Petrie, de Sarzec, de Morgan, Hilprecht, Koldwey, Sellin and others. The second function of archeology consists in examining the material documents and finds, in determining their quality and genuineness as well as their age and contents. The third function consists in ordering these same material documents; and in this the principal method is that of comparison. But it must be clearly understood that archeology, as such, without its supplementary or rather complementary branch, history, is of very little avail for the reconstruction of the past. Both are essential and inseparable sources for any successful attempt to understand the past and to grasp the principal historical, social, and religious evolutions of the human race in bygone ages.

Archeology has always been a fascinating study. Even as far back as the sixth and seventh century B. C. we find Assyrian and Babylonian princes and priests, such as Assurbanipal, Nabonidus, Berosus and others diligently engaged in searching for the early remains of their predecessors. Temples were excavated, their foundations eagerly sought and examined, and their records and inscriptions copied and jealously preserved in the royal libraries and archives.

---

[11]Hogarth, *op. cit.*, loc. cit.

[12]On this important function of Archeology, Dr. Flinders Petrie has recently written a very valuable little volume entitled *Methods and Aims in Archeology*, London, 1904; which is full of interesting remarks and practical suggestions.

They furnished a vast field for study and investigation to the priests and wise men of the nation; and, as Berosus (a Babylonian priest of the time of Alexander the Great, who compiled a history of his own country, now unfortunately lost) tells us, such records and documents were diligently kept in the Babylonian temples and schools, thus furnishing him with abundant materials for his history and chronology of Babylonia and Assyria. This same archeological instinct was still more noticeable in Greece, Rome and medieval Europe; but naturally enough, it was more often a recreation of *Dilettanti* than a subject of serious scientific inquiry. The necessity of introducing the scientific element into these archeological studies was deeply felt since the seventeenth century, and especially in the nineteenth, when archeology, by applying strictly scientific methods, has fairly established a claim to be a science of primary importance for the purposes of history. In this sense archeology is still a youthful science, for the impulse towards exact methods and systematic excavations does not date further back than the first or second quarter of the last century which opened the East, Egypt and Greece to European scholars and explorers. It suffers, sometimes, from the impossibility of verifying many of its hypotheses, especially in dealing with periods before written history began. But at least the processes and methods by which it fulfils its three functions in regard to the material documents of the human past (those of discovering, examining, and ordering) have steadily grown more and more scientific and trustworthy.[13]

Oriental and Biblical archeology is only a branch of archeology in general, but to us, the most important one. Next in importance are the Greek and Roman branches which represent a later section of human history and form a connecting link between ancient and modern civilization.

The field of Oriental history and archeology, in their relation to the Old Testament, is clearly defined by the fact that only those countries and peoples are included in its limits which have come more or less into close contact with the Hebrew nation. Those countries are what we generally call "*Bible lands*," i. e., Babylonia, the original home of Israel's immediate ancestors; Palestine, the *rendezvous* of the Hebrew patriarchs in their primitive migration and settlements; Egypt, the land of their woes and afflictions as well as of their preparations to become an independent and conquering nation, where they

[13]Hogarth, *op. cit.*, pp. ix-x.

came into contact with a long-settled and advanced civilization; then again the Promised Land, the goal of their own and their forefathers' aspirations, the principal theater of their national life and formation, the land of their internal struggles and rise to become an important factor in the history of ancient civilization, and the scene of their religious development; then Assyria, and the land of the Hittites, as well as those of the Canaanites, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Aramæans, Arabians and many other tribes and nations against whom Israel had to struggle for centuries in order to preserve its national independence; finally, once more, Babylonia and Chaldea, the land of their exile and dispersion.

From a geographical point of view all these Bible lands occupy but a comparatively small area in one of the corners of Asia. Their territory is bounded on the North, by Mt. Taurus and the mountains of Armenia; on the East, by the mountains of Kurdistan, Khuzistan and the Persian Gulf; on the South by the Indian Ocean; and on the West by the Mediterranean Sea.

Oriental history which, as we have stated above, forms an inseparable and integral part of Oriental archeology, divides itself naturally into three main periods: the first, that of the development of the Semitic nationalities; the second, that of the supremacy of the Indo-Germanic Persians, Greeks and Romans; the third, that of the rise and dominion of Islam.[14] The first epoch embraces the long tract of centuries from the formation and division of the Semitic tribes to the fall of Babylon and its capture by Cyrus in the sixth century B. C.; the second, that of the domination of the Medes, Persians, Greeks and Romans over Western Asia, from the fall of Babylon to the rise of Islam, in the seventh century after the Christian Era; while the last begins with the diffusion and supremacy of Islam, and continues through the successive dominations of the Arabs, Mongolians and Turks till our own days. As is evident, Biblico-Oriental Archeology embraces the first period only, for the simple reason that with the end of this first period of Oriental history the relation between the Hebrew people and the ancient East comes to an end.

This first period of Oriental history, however, is itself sub-divided into three other historical epochs: the first, that of the origins of the

[14]L. B. Paton *The Early History of Syria and Palestine*, New York, 1901, pp ix-x. Cf. also MacCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, New York, 1895-1900, Vol. I, ch. I-III.

Semites before their divisions into independent tribes and nations; the second, that of the divisions and migrations of the several Semitic tribes; the third, that of the development and historical vicissitudes of the different Semitic nationalities, with their successive dynasties and kingdoms, from the third millennium B. C. down to the fall of Babylon and the ascendary of the Persian and Græco-Roman powers

Gabriel Oussani.

STUDIES

STUDIES ON THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

Francis E. Gigot

V. The Call of the First Disciples.

A Literary Analysis of Mk. i, 16-20; Mt. iv. 18-22; Lk. v, 1-11.

It is consonant with all our sources of information that soon after the beginning of His public life, Jesus called a few Galilean fishermen to follow Him. From the first, He was fully aware of the difficulties which awaited Him in preaching "the Gospel of God" to His earthly contemporaries, and therefore He invited without delay a few men of good will and inured to fatigue to share His missionary labors. From the first too, He knew that His preaching would be confined within the limits of the Holy Land, and that it was to be extended to the Gentiles after His departure by those who had accompanied Him "all the time that He came in and went out among us" (Acts i, 21), and hence, it behooved Him to promptly surround Himself with trusty witnesses of His life and teachings.

In view of this, it is only natural that after having examined in our last Study the Synoptic account of the beginning of Our Lord's ministry, we should devote the present paper to a literary analysis of the Call of the First disciples recorded in Mk. i, 16-20; Mt. iv, 18-22; Lk. v, 1-11.[1]

I. Primitive Character of Mk's Account.

Of these three parallel accounts, that of St. Mark claims first our attention. As might well be expected, it bears throughout the impress of Mk's style, and exhibits traits of primitive simplicity. Its opening line: "And passing along by the Sea of Galilee" (Mk. i, 16a) is the direct and artless continuation of the immediately preceding account wherein we are told of Jesus coming into Galilee and preaching the Gospel of God. Like it, it begins with the simple Hebrew conjunction ו *και* (and). Its intimate connection with it, is further indicated by the expression *παραγων* (passing along),[2] which is in thorough harmony with the fact that in the pre-

[1] A direct translation from the original Greek of these three accounts, will be found in parallel columns on a special page, at the end of this paper.

[2] The reading *καὶ παράγων* instead of *περιπατῶν δὲ* found in the ordinary Greek text, is to be admitted. Cf. Jos. Knabenbauer, S. J., *in Marcum*, p. 39; H. B. Sweete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 13.

ceding section St. Mark has represented Our Lord as not yet settled in Capharnaum, on the shore of the Sea of Galilee. It speaks of "the *Sea* of Galilee," because the Hebrews of old called "a *sea*" any large body of water, and because the writer has simply preserved the primitive form of expression.

The next lines of Mk's first verse (i, 16) read as follows:

> He saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon,
> casting in the sea,
> for they were fishermen.

The absence of Our Lord's personal name (Jesus) as a subject of the verb ειδεν (He saw) is due to the intimate connection which exists between the present account and the one immediately preceding. As Jesus is distinctly named in the narrative of His return into Galilee and of His early preaching there (Mk. i, 14c), St. Mark does not think it necessary to name Him again at the beginning of the next section (Mk. i, 16-20), because this section presents the call of the first disciples as taking place directly upon Christ's return and at the earliest stage in the Galilean ministry.[3] The statement itself "He saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon," smacks of Mk's primitive simplicity. Here, as is his wont elsewhere,[4] our second Synoptist repeats the substantive (Simon), whereas the use of a pronoun in its stead would manifestly be more elegant. A similar artless way of writing appears in the next expression: "casting in the Sea," where the verb αμφιβαλλειν (to cast) would so naturally demand an object (casting a *net*, a *drag*, etc.) as its complement, that some transcribers of our second Gospel have modified the text before them, and written casting "*the net*," or "*the nets*" into the Sea."[5] As regards the final clause in Mk. i, 16 "for they were fishers," it bears the distinct stamp of Marcan simplicity. Time and again in our subsequent Studies we will have to call attention to similar clauses subjoined by our second Synoptist for the purpose of explaining a statement of his.[6]

The second verse in Mk. i, 16-20, opens like the first with the simple Hebrew conjunction ו και (and).:

> Mk. i, 17a: *And* Jesus said to them: Come after me.

[3]Cf. Allan Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 65.

[4]Cf. the repetition of τὰ δαιμόνια in Mk. i, 34; of τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν in Mk. ii, 16; etc. The suggestion recently made by E. A. Abbott (*The Corrections of Mark*, pp. 70, 71) to account for the repetition of Simon's name in Mk. i, 16, is decidedly fanciful.

[5]For the documentary evidence in this regard, see Knabenbauer, *loc. cit.*; and H. B. Sweete, *loc. cit.*

[6]Cf. Mk. i, 22; i, 27; ii, 15; iii, 2; iii, 10; etc.

The name of Jesus is naturally inserted, because others, besides Him have been named in the course of the preceding verse, so that the actual speaker needs now to be specified. Our Lord's invitation "Come after Me," is worded in a Greek which directly reminds us of the Hebrew construction הלך אחרי, on account of its use of the adverb as a preposition *οπισο μου* (after Me). No less Hebraistic in form is the promise added by Jesus, "and I will make you to become fishers of men:" it begins with the subordinate conjunction ו *και*;[7] presents the construction *ποιησω γενεσθαι* (*I will make you to become*) which points back directly to the Hebrew form עשה להיות; and concludes with the expression *αλεεις ανθρωπων* (fishers of men) peculiarly connected with the word *αλεεις* (fishers) at the end of the preceding verse ("for they were *fishermen*,") because the writer has carefully preserved the primitive play upon the Hebrew word דיגים (fishers).

Mk's next verse gives the result of Christ's call to Simon and Andrew:

> Mk. i, 18. And straightway leaving the nets
> they followed Him.

It is a simple, matter-of-fact, statement, such as one would naturally expect in a primitive record of Our Lord's public life, and such as we have repeatedly noticed in our analysis of the preceding sections of our second Gospel. In fact, it is characterized by the use of the simple Hebrew conjunction ו *και* (and), as also by the distinctly Marcan adverb *ευθυς* (straightway).

At verse 19, St. Mark begins to narrate the call of another pair of brothers. The verse may be rendered as follows:

> Mk. i, 19. And having gone forward a little,
> He saw James, the son of Zebedee, and John his brother,
> them also in the boat,
> mending the nets.

It obviously bears the same stamp of Marcan simplicity and primitiveness as the preceding verses. Like them, it begins with the conjunction ו *και*. Like them it describes in graphic and somewhat inelegant terms (notice the expressions *ολιγον* "a little," *και αυτους* "them also," peculiar to St. Mark's account) Our Lord's meeting with two of the first disciples, James and John. And in particular, the rather indefinite Greek verb *καταρτιζειν* "to mend" which means in general to put in complete order, and by which the present occupa-

[7] Cf. Ernest De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, 2d edit., § 269; and Chas. P. Faganani, *A Hebrew Primer*, 2d edit., p. 35.

tion of James and John is set forth, corresponds to the likewise general term αμφιβαλλειν noticed above in connection with Mk. i, 16b, and whereby the actual occupation of Simon and Andrew is described.

The artless simplicity and primitive character of Mk's concluding verse (i, 20) can also be easily pointed out. Its opening line: "and straightway He called them," is the direct and plain statement of a fact. It is connected with the preceding verse by the simple Hebrew conjunction ו και and the Marcan adverb ευθυς, and graphically represents Jesus bidding James and John to follow Him without any preliminary or preparatory act on His part. Equally graphic and simple are the last two lines:

> and leaving their father, Zebedee, in the boat
> with the hired men, they went away after Him.

The scene which followed on Christ's call is introduced by the conjunction και (and); and although it is vividly drawn in its various details, yet it does not present anything that would betray a comparatively late reflection on the part of the writer upon the generous obedience of James and John.

Thus then the narrative of the call of the first disciples in our second Gospel, bears throughout the impress of St. Mark's own style, and exhibits numerous traits of original simplicity. There is nothing in it that must needs be considered as derived from the other Synoptists. The sentences are built and connected in primitive Hebrew fashion, exactly in the same manner as in the preceding sections of St. Mark's Gospel which we have thus far studied. And the closer one examines the statements in Mk. i, 16-20, the more he feels that here, as in connection with the other sections, he is in presence of a throroughly objective account of the facts narrated.

II. Derived Character of Mt's. Account.

This primitive character of Mk's narrative of the call of Our Lord's first disciples appears especially manifest when Mk. i, 16-20 is compared with Mt's parallel account of the same event (Mt. iv, 18-22). The first two Gospels stand here in intimate relation, and their differences when carefully examined prove to be variations from Mk's record:

Mk. i, 16-20.	Mt. iv, 18-22.
16. And passing along by the Sea of Galilee,	18. *But walking* by the Sea of Galilee,

He saw Simon, and Andrew, the brother of Simon,	He saw *two brothers*, Simon, *who is called Peter*, and Andrew, *his* brother,
casting in the Sea,	casting *a net* into the Sea,
for they were fishermen.	for they were fishermen.
17. And Jesus said to them: Come after Me,	19. And *He saith* to them: Come after Me,
and I will make you *to become* fishers of men.	and I will make you fishers of men.
18. And straightway leaving the nets they followed Him.	20. *But they* straightway leaving the nets followed Him.
19. And having gone forward a little,	21. And having gone on *from thence*,
He saw James, the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother,	He saw *other two brothers*, James, the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother,
them also in the boat,	in the boat *with Zebedee their father*,
mending the nets;	mending their nets;
20. and straightway He called them.	and He called them.
And leaving their father, Zebedee, in the boat	22. But they *straightway* leaving the *boat and their father*,
with the hired men, they went away after Him.	followed him.

A rapid comparison of these parallel passages suffices to convince any one that there is a literary connection between them. They both tell how "Simon and Andrew," and next "James and John," became the followers of Jesus. Both place the event by "the Sea of Galilee," narrate the same incidents in exactly the same order, and use almost invariably the same expressions either to introduce, formulate, or conclude their sentences.[8] Both likewise exhibit practically the same objective character inasmuch as they simply record Our Lord's call and the prompt answer it received from the two pairs of brothers, and seem to be absolutely unconcerned about the reason which may have induced Simon and Andrew, James and John to obey at once the summons of Jesus. Nay, more, even the small differences noticeable between the two accounts point to an actual literary relation between Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22: for all such differences, when closely examined, are easily explained as Mt's intentional variations from Mk's narrative.

This is certainly the case with the two differences which Mt's opening line presents when compared with Mk's own first line:

Mk. i, 16a.	Mt. iv, 18a.
And passing along by the Sea of Galilee.	*But walking by* the Sea of Galilee.

St. Matthew uses here the verb περιπατων "walking by" in preference to Mk's corresponding verb παραγων "passing along

[8]The manner in which the clause "for they were fishers" is introduced in both Mt. and Mk., makes powerfully for a literary connection between the two narratives. (Cf. Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 43.)

by," because in his preceding section he has represented Our Lord as already settled in Capharnaum (Mt. iv, 13b), a representation which was shown in our last Study to be an insertion into Mk's narrative. In view of this insertion, it plainly behooved our first Synoptist not to speak here of Jesus as "passing along by" the Sea of Galilee, as yet on His way from Judea to Capharnaum, but rather to describe Him as "walking by" the Sea, as one already dwelling in the maritime city of Capharnaum. The second difference bears on Mt's preference of the particle δε (περιπατων δε) instead of Mk's conjunction και (και παραγων). It is plain that in Mk., the conjunction και represents directly the primitive Hebrew conjunction ו (and), and that the construction και παραγων leaves the conjunction και at its original place in a Semitic narrative, while Mt's particle δε and construction περιπατων δε are Greek forms which betoken a desire of his to improve on Mk's less elegant, because more primitive style.

Mt's next line is likewise less primitive than the corresponding one in Mk's narrative:

Mk. i, 16b.	Mt. iv, 18b.
He saw Simon and Andrew, the brother of Simon.	He saw *two brothers*, Simon *who is called Peter*, and Andrew, *his* brother.

To the bare and somewhat inelegant statement of our second Gospel, St. Matthew adds two particulars which bespeak a later redaction: through reflection upon the incident simply recorded in Mk. i, 16b, he informs his readers that Jesus saw "two brothers,"[9] and distinctly tells them that the *Simon* here spoken of, is the one "who is called Peter."[10] He also modifies Mk's expression "Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon," and uses the pronoun αυτου (his) instead of the substantive "Simon" (and Andrew his brother), for the purpose of making the sentence run more smoothly.

The same derived character of Mt's account appears in the next line: "casting a net into the Sea" (Mt. iv, 18c) as compared with Mk. i, 16c: "casting in the Sea." For Mt's fuller and more grammatical form βαλλοντα αμφιβληστρον εις την θαλασσαν, is plainly later than Mk's expression αμφιβαλλοντας εν τη θαλασση.[11]

[9]Mt's addition of the expression "two brothers" at iv, 18b, is intentional as clearly appears from the addition "*other* two brothers" which he makes a little later at iv, 21b, in connection with Our Lord's call of the second pair of brothers.

[10]Among the Apostles, whose full list is given later in the Synoptics, there was another *Simon* (cf. Mt. x, 4; Mk. iii, 18; Lk. vi, 15).

[11]Cf. Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 106.

The differences noticeable in Mt's next verse (verse 19) point likewise to the derived character of his account of Our Lord's call of the first disciples:

Mk. i, 17.	Mt. iv, 19.
And Jesus said to them: Come after Me, and I will you to become fishers of men.	And He *saith* to them: Come after Me, and I will make you . . . fishers of men.

St. Matthew drops the name of Jesus which is found in Mk. i, 17a, because he has introduced it after his insertion of the passage of Isaias into his preceding section (Mt. iv, 17a), and consequently does not feel the need of repeating it here at the distance of only a few lines. Differently from Mk's use of the past tense (Jesus *said* to them), he next employs the historical present (He *saith* to them) so as to give his sentence a special vividness. And instead of the awkward Semitic construction in Mk. i, 17b: "I will make you *to become* fishers of men," he writes: "and I will make you fishers of men:" a happy modification which makes the sentence more simple and elegant, but also less primitive.

This desire on the part of St. Matthew to improve upon St. Mark's style is also visible in his next verse:

Mk. i, 18.	Mt. iv, 20.
And straightway leaving the nets they followed Him.	*But they* straightway leaving the nets followed Him.

He does not connect like St. Mark, this verse with the preceding, by means of the simple Hebrew conjunction ו *και*, but adopts in its stead the particle δε and prefixes to it the pronoun οι (they) which in Mk., is only implied in the form of the verb ηκολουθησαν. Thus does St. Matthew obtain a better Greek formula of connection (οι δε, but they), and indeed one which suggests more distinctly than the mere conjunction και, what Simon and Andrew did on their part, to immediately answer the Master's call.

The last two verses of St. Matthew's narrative, tell, like the last two in St. Mark's account, of the call of James and John to discipleship. And here again, we meet with important literary differences which lead us to regard Mt's redaction as later than that of our second Gospel.

Mk. i.	Mt. iv.
19. And having gone forward a little, He saw James the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother, them also in the boat, mending the nets;	21. And having gone on from thence, He saw *other two brothers*, James, the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother, in the boat *with Zebedee, their father*, mending their nets;

20. and straightway He called them. And leaving their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired men, they went after Him.	and He called them. 22. But they straightway leaving the boat and their father, followed Him.

The first of these important differences is connected with Mt. iv, 21b. It consists in the significant insertion into Mk's words, of the clause "other two brothers," which was manifestly made here in view of the addition of the words "two brothers" in Mt. iv, 18b, which we have examined above. As at iv, 18b, St. Matthew had written: "He saw *two brothers*, Simon . . . and Andrew his brother;" so now (iv, 21b) he writes: "He saw *other two brothers*, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother." Whence it is only natural to consider this second counting of the brothers met by Jesus in the same light as the first. Like the first it is due to Mt's later reflection upon Mk's more objective, and consequently more primitive statement: "He saw James the son of Zebedee and John his brother" (Mk. i, 19b).[12]

The second literary difference to be noticed is found in Mt's next line the meaning of which is much more obvious than that of Mk's parallel statement:

Mk. i, 19c.	Mt. iv, 21c.
them also in the boat.	in the boat *with Zebedee their father.*

In fact, Mt. iv, 21c reads like an interpretation of Mk's obscure sentence. St. Matthew took Mk's elliptic clause "them also" to mean that when Jesus saw James and John, these two future disciples were: *they and* (*και αυτοι* "they also)" their father in the boat. And indeed this meaning appeared to him the only one natural in view of the expressions "leaving *their father Zebedee in the boat*," found in Mk's very next verse (Mk. i, 20b). It seems therefore that when our first Synoptist substituted "with Zebedee their father" for Mk's "them also," he simply intended to set forth more clearly the sense of the document before him.

In recording the fact that Jesus called James and John, St. Matthew introduced into Mk's wording a change which is also worthy of notice:

---

[12]Plainly the expression "his brother" was superfluous after Mt. had added "other two brothers." Its presence in Mt. iv, 21b, is due to the fact that St. Matthew preserved it from Mk's Gospel where it is natural (Mk. i, 19b).

Mk. i, 20c.	Mt. iv, 21c.
and straightway He called them.	and He called them.

In dropping the adverb "straightway," St. Matthew has apparently done here, what from our preceding Studies we know he is wont to do in regard to expressions which might seem derogatory to, or unworthy of the Messias. That adverb when used in connection with the call of His disciples by Jesus might suggest lack of self-control, unbecoming haste on His part, and in consequence our first Synoptist omitted it here. That he was fully aware of its presence in Mk's narrative is shown by the fact that he preserved it for his own next line, where great promptitude was only befitting in John and James when they left everything to answer the Lord's call: "But they *straightway* leaving the boat and their father."

The insertion of the adverb "straightway" is not the only significant change which Mt's concluding verse presents as compared with Mk's last parallel lines:

Mk. i, 20bc.	Mt. iv, 22.
And leaving their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired men, they went after Him.	*But they straightway* leaving *the boat and* their father *followed* Him.

Briefly stated the other changes made by St. Matthew are these: (1) he introduces his sentence by οι δε "but they," an expression which, as we showed in connection with Mt. iv, 20, is indeed a better Greek, but also less primitive a form than Mk's conjunction και (Heb. ו); (2) he brings out more fully than St. Mark the relative greatness of the sacrifice made by James and John,[13] by saying that they left "*the boat and* their father" instead of Mk's statement "leaving "*their father in* the boat;" and whereas he inserts here into Mk's words the adverb "straightway" with the same view of emphasizing the merit of their obedience to Christ's call; he, on the contrary, drops Mk's reference to "the hired men," apparently because the fact that after their departure, Zebedee, their father, would still be helped by those mercenaries was rather calculated to detract from the generous character of their obedience; (3) finally, he prefers to the Hebrew, and certainly more primitive expression απηλθον οπισω αυτου "they went after Him" (Mk. i, 20c), the better Greek form ηκολουθησαν αυτω "they followed Him."

[13]Cf. H. B. Sweete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 15.

III. Peculiarities of Lk's Account.

The foregoing study of Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22, was a comparatively easy task. The two passages run on closely parallel lines, so that their resemblances and differences can be easily noticed and their degree of relationship be made out without much difficulty. The case stands very differently with Lk. v, 1-11, when compared with Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22. The simple reading of Lk's passage discloses differences of all kinds; and in point of fact, a further examination of it has suggested to many minds the conclusion that our third evangelist records in v, 1-11, not the same call of Christ's first disciples as is described in Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22, but one distinct from, and subsequent to it.[14] Lk's narrative runs as follows:

Lk. v, 1-11.

1. Now it came to pass while the multitude
pressed upon Him and heard the word of God,
that He was Himself standing by the lake of Gennesaret;
2. and He saw two boats standing by the lake;
but the fishermen having gone out of them
were washing the nets.
3. But having gone into one of the boats, which was Simon's,
He asked him to put out a little from the land,
and sitting down He taught the multitudes from the boat.
4. But when he Had left speaking, He said to Simon:
Put out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.
5. And Simon, answering, said:
Master, having toiled the whole night, we have taken nothing;
but at Thy word I will let down the nets.
6. And having done this, they inclosed a great multitude of fishes,
and their nets were breaking.
7. And they beckoned to their partners in the other boat
to come and help them; and they came,
and filled both the boats so that they were sinking.
8. But Simon Peter seeing it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying:
Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord,
9. For amazement seized him and all who were with him,
at the draught of the fishes which they had taken;
10. and in like manner also, James and John, sons of Zebedee,
who were partners with Simon.
And Jesus said to Simon:
Fear not; henceforth thou shalt catch men.
11. And having brought the boats to land,
and left all, they followed Him.

The principal differences between this passage and Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22, are obvious. The whole scene with which St. Luke

[14]Cf. Knabenbauer, S. J., *in Matth.*, vol. i, p. 164.

opens his narrative (v. 1-3) has no clear equivalent in these sections of our first two Gospels. To find a parallel to St. Luke's picture of Jesus followed by great multitudes, entering a boat and teaching from it the crowd which has gathered upon the shore, we must look much farther into the contents of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels. It is only at Mk. iv, and Mt. xiii, that we meet with such a picture; and it is worthy of notice that in their narratives both Mt. and Mk. give it as an introduction to the parable of the Sower, while our third evangelist allots that parable to some unnamed place and apparently to the time of a missionary tour (Lk. viii, 4 sqq.)

The narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes which follows in St. Luke's section (v, 4sqq.), forms a second and most important difference. Not only is this miraculous occurrence not recorded by the first two Synoptists in connection with the call of Christ's first disciples, but also it is nowhere mentioned in their Gospels. To find a description actually similar to the one given in Lk. v, 4-9, we must turn to our fourth Gospel and indeed to its last chapter (John xxi, 1 sqq.)[15] In the third place, the prominence ascribed to Simon Peter in St. Luke's narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes stands in striking contrast with the position which the same disciple occupies in both Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22. In the first two Synoptics, Simon is simply one of the fishermen whom Jesus met by the side of the lake; his call differs in no way from that of Andrew, and he obeys Jesus' summons in exactly the same manner as Andrew and James and John. In our third Gospel, on the contrary, Simon appears as the owner of the boat which Jesus enters to teach the people (verse 3a); Simon alone is bidden to draw back a little from the land and next to launch out into the deep (verses 3b, 4b); Simon is the spokesman in behalf of his partners:

> Lk. v, 5. And Simon, answering, said:
> Master, having toiled the whole night, we have taken nothing;
> but at Thy word I will let down the nets;

again, Peter's words to Jesus: "depart from me for I am a sinful man, O Lord," are explicitly given as the outcome of his great astonish-

[15]Among the particulars which are common to Lk. v, 1-11, and John xxi, 1-19, the following may be mentioned: Peter appears in both as the leader in respect to James and John; in both, the fishermen have been unable to catch anything during the night; in both, Jesus gives a direction that the net should be cast into the sea; in both, a great haul of fishes is the reward of obedience to Jesus' direction. For the principal differences between Lk. v, 1-11, and John xxi, 1 sqq., see Cheyne, *Encyl. Biblica*, vol. II, col. 1786, footn. 5.

ment (verses 8, 9), and we are told that this astonishment was shared by "all who were with him" (verse 9); Peter alone is invited to become a fisher of men (verse 10), and the others, who also become followers of Jesus, do so apparently after Peter's example (verse 11). Plainly, in all this we are far from the description o Peter's position in Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22; farther still, if anything, from the tradition embodied in our fourth Gospel (John i, 35 sqq.), according to which Andrew came first to Jesus and next introduced Peter to Him, whereas in Lk. v, 1-11, Andrew is not even mentioned by name.

Two other important differences in representation can also be easily observed between Lk. v, 1-11, on the one hand, and Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22, on the other. First, while St. Luke's narrative deals continuously throughout with only one call, that of Peter, the other two records are broken into two distinct sections, the first of which narrates the call of Peter and Andrew, and the second, the call of James and John. In the second place, while St. Luke makes the readiness of the first disciples to follow Jesus immediately subsequent to their witnessing of a great miracle, the other two evangelists represent those disciples as yielding obedience to a simple call of Christ.

Besides these larger and more obvious differences, there are minor variations well worthy of notice. For example, Lk. v, 1c, speaks of Jesus as "standing" by the lake of Gennesaret, whereas Mk. i, 16, says that He was "passing along," and Mt. iv, 18a, states that He was "walking," by that lake. Again, according to our third evangelist (Lk. v, 2), Jesus saw two *boats* standing by the lake, and the fishermen had *gone out of them* and were *washing* the nets, whereas according to the other two Synoptists, the *men* whom Jesus saw were, the first pair of them, actually engaged in *casting* a net into the Sea of Galilee (Mk. i, 16c; Mt. iv. 18c), and the second pair, actually *in the boat* with Zebedee, their father (Mk. i, 19c; Mt. iv, 21c). Lastly, what St. Luke records of the care which Jesus' first disciples took to bring their boats to land (Lk. v, 11a) before they followed Him, seems to be a variation from what both St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us of the promptitude of those disciples in leaving everything (cf. particularly Mt. iv, 22).

Side by side with these differences in representation, or rather mingled with them, Lk. v, 1-11, exhibits numerous and telling peculiarities of style and vocabulary. This is indeed particularly the case with the opening verse wherein nearly every word or expression is characteristic of St. Luke's diction: thus besides the Lucan forms

(εγενετο δε εν τω followed by a present infinitive to express time *during* which; the conjunction και to introduce the apodosis; the expression και αυτος) already pointed out in our preceding Studies, Lk. v, 1, contains the analytical form ην εστως, the compound verb επικεισθαι and especially the expression η λιμνη Γεννησαρετ wherein the word *lake* (λιμνη) used exclusively by our third evangelist is more accurate, but less primitive, than the word *sea* (θαλασσα) employed by the other two Synoptists. But even the rest of the section bears the unmistakable impress of St. Luke's style, as may be readily seen from such Lucan peculiarities as the following: (1) the compound verbs επαναγαγειν verses 3, 5), καταγαγειν (verse 11),[16] which are both correct nautical terms; (2) the title of επιστατη (verse 5) always used by St. Luke, and by him alone, instead of Ραββει; (3) the favorite words πιμπλαναι and αμφοτεροι in verse 7; (4) the construction εξερχομαι απο (verse 8);[17] (5) the substantive θαμβος, the compound verb συλλαμβανειν, the idiomatic attraction of the relative (των ιχθυων ων), and the characteristic use of πας and συν (all in verse 9); (6) the use of προς after μη φοβου, of ειπειν without an accusative, and of the expression απο του νυν, in verse 10; (7) the characteristic παντα, in verse 11.[18]

IV. Lk's Resemblances With Mt. and Mk.

In view of all these peculiarities, and also in view of the fact that apparently our third evangelist places his account at a later stage in Our Lord's ministry than is done by the other two Synoptists, one readily understands how since the middle of the second century most harmonists have regarded Lk. v, 1-11 as not describing the same event as Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22.[19] And yet Lk. v, 1-11 has such significant resemblances with the other two accounts as well to make scholars hesitate before admitting this position.

Like St. Matthew and St. Mark, St. Luke describes a meeting of Jesus with "fishermen." Three of these, Simon, James and John, he mentions by name, and they are exactly the same as in the other

[16]Cf. W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament*, p. 533.

[17]Cf. John C. Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, pp. 15, 32; A. Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 135.

[18]Cf. A. Plummer, *St. Luke*, pp. 142-146; John C. Hawkins, *loc. cit.*; and preceding Nos. of The New York Review.

[19]In his Diatessaron, Tatian (fl. 170 A. D.) fuses in one Mt's and Mk's accounts, because he clearly sees that they relate the same incident; then he gives Lk's account separately as if dealing with another event.

two Synoptics. The presence of at least a fourth one is implied in Lk's plural orms καλασατε τα δικτυα υμων (verse 4); κοπιασαντες ουδεν ελαβομεν (verse 5); ποιησαντες συνεκλεισαν τα δικτυα (verse 6); κατενευσαν ···αυτοις (verse 7); and that this fourth one is no other than Andrew, Simon's brother, who is distinctly named by St. Matthew and St. Mark, can hardly be doubted: the two brothers, Simon and Andrew, naturally worked together in the same vessel, as did 'James and John, the sons of Zebedee."[20] The place where Jesus met the fishermen s identical in our first three Gospels, viz.: the lake of Gennesaret or Sea of Galilee. Peter's prominence in St. Luke's narrative is not without some manner of a counterpart in Mk's expression: "He (Jesus) saw Simon, and Andrew the brother of Simon" (Mk. i, 16), and in Mt's parallel form "He (Jesus) saw two brothers, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother" (Mt. iv, 18): even in Mt's and Mk's records Peter is a leader at least in respect to Andrew his brother.[21] Although St. Luke says in the preamble to his narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes, that the fishermen "had gone out of" the boats, yet when he describes that miracle he agrees with Mt's and Mk's statements that James and John were *in* their boat (cf. Lk. v, 7, with Mk. i, 19, and Mt. iv, 21). In St. Luke (v, 10), as in St. Mark (i, 17) and in St. Matthew (iv, 19), we find reported a symbolical promise of Jesus which is clothed in language borrowed from the avocation of fishermen, although in St. Luke alone is that promise restricted to Simon Peter: "from henceforth thou shalt catch men," and made in terms which recall less the original play upon Christ's aramaic expressions: "I will make you fishers of men," preserved in the other two Gospels. Lastly, Lk's concluding line "having left all, they followed Him" exhibits two close resemblances to Mt. and Mk.: it contains first the important word αφεντες (Lk. v, 11; Mk. i, 20; Mt. iv, 22), and secondly the expression ηκολουθησαν αυτω. (Cf. Lk. v, 11; Mk. i, 18; Mt. iv, 20, 22). Hence the relation which according to that line of St. Luke's narrative will henceforth exist between Jesus and His first disciples is apparently the same as that stated in Mt's and Mk's accounts, and therefore we cannot well suppose that the call to discipleship recorded by the first two

[20]Cf. St. Augustine, *The Harmony of the Evangelists*, Book ii, chap. xvii, No. 37; and commentators generally.

[21]Cf. Allan Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 65. See also Mk. i, 29, where ew read: "They came into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John;" a passage which implies the inferiority not only of Andrew, but also of James and John, to Simon Peter.

Synoptists was followed at any comparatively short time afterwards, by another call in the same words but under different circumstances, and chronicled by Luke alone.[22]

V. How St. Luke Considers His Own Account.

Had we then at our disposal only the similarities we have just pointed out we would still feel justified in thinking, with many scholars of the present and of the past, that Lk. v, 1-11 records the same final call of Jesus' first disciples as is narrated in Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22. But besides there is another datum which makes powerfully for that same conclusion. A careful comparison of Mk. i, 16-iii, 6 and Lk. iv, 31-vi, 11, that is of the parallel larger sections which include Mk's and Lk's respective account of the call of the first disciples of Christ, enables us to realize that our third evangelist considers his own account of it as an equivalent of the one supplied by St. Mark. The following are the principal results yielded by the comparison:

(1) Both Mk. i, 16-iii, 6 and Lk. iv, 31-vi, 11, contain exactly the same number of incidents, viz.: 12, as can be readily seen from the subjoined table:

Mk.	Lk.
i, 16–20	. . .
21–28	iv, 31–17
29–31	38–39
32–34	40–41
35–39	42–44
. . .	v, 1–11
i, 40–45	12–16
ii, 1–12	17–26
13–14	27–28
15–17	29–32
18–22	33–39
23–28	vi, 1– 5
iii, 1– 6	6–11

(2) Of these 12 incidents, 11 are unquestionably the same in both St. Mark and St. Luke, for they deal with the same topics and have the closest resemblances in style and representation; and the 12th, the one now under consideration, has the same general purpose in both Gospels, to wit, that of describing a final call of Our Lord's early dicisples.

(3) Again, in both Mk. and Lk., the 12 incidents follow the same order, with the sole exception that the one narrating that final

[22]Cf. Jos. Knabenbauer S. J., *in Matthæum*, vol. i, p. 165.

call, is in St. Mark at the very beginning of his section (Mk. i, 16-20), while in St. Luke, it is found in the body of his own section at v, 1-11.

(4) Both Mk. i, 29, and Lk. iv, 38, mention Simon's name in such a way as to imply that Simon has been already introduced to the reader. This shows that the sole variation in the order of the incidents in Mk. and Lk., did not exist primitively, but was introduced by St. Luke, who, differently from St. Mark, has not yet narrated the final call of Simon and the other early disciples of Jesus, and consequently has not yet made Simon known to his readers.[23]

(5) Lastly, in St. Luke as in St. Mark, the call of Christ's early disciples is represented, even after Lk's inversion in the order of the incidents, as having taken place under the same general circumstances. In Lk. as in Mk., that event is recorded immediately after a reference to Our Lord's general mission of preaching the Gospel (Cf. Lk. iv, 43, 44, and Mk. i, 14, 15). And again, in Lk. as in Mk., the call is considered as having occurred at the beginning of Christ's public ministry.

When all this is borne in mind, together with the fact that neither Mk. nor Lk. narrates anywhere else a final call of Our Lord's early disciples, the following conclusion becomes morally certain. St. Luke had before him Mk's short account of that call at the precise place in the series of 12 incidents where it is found in our second Gospel, and he did not simply transcribe it because he wished to give what he regarded as its fuller equivalent, viz., the narrative which now makes up Lk. v, 1-11.

VI. Lk's Dependence on Mk. and Mt.

It it this fuller account of Our Lord's call of His first disciples which it now behooves us to examine closely with a view to ascertain whether and to what extent it bespeaks a dependence on the part of our third evangelist on the other two Synoptists. Its opening scene (Lk. v, 1-3) reads as follows:

> 1. Now it came to pass while the multitude
> pressed upon Him and heard the word of God,
> that He was Himself standing by the lake of Gennesaret;
> 2. And He saw two boats standing by the lake;
> but the fishermen having gone out of them
> were washing the nets.

[23]Compare with this the awkward place ascribed by St. Luke to the rending of the veil *before* the death of Jesus (Lk. xxiii, 45), and to Christ's miracles spoken of in Lk. iv, 23, as performed in Capharnaum, although Jesus' going to that city is mentioned only *afterwards* (Lk. iv, 31); etc.

3. But having gone into one of the boats, which was Simon's,
He asked him to put out a little from the land,
and sitting down He taught the multitudes from the boat.

It is quite true that this opening scene has no direct equivalent in Mt's and Mk's parallel accounts of Christ's call of His early disciples. But this does not imply in the least that here St. Luke is altogether independent of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels. Critics and commentators generally admit that Lk's scene (Lk. v, 1-3,) is parallel to the following one with which the other two Synoptists open their respective records of Our Lord's parables of the Kingdom:

Mk. iv, 1-2a.	Mt. xiii, 1-3a.
1. And again He began to teach	1. The same day, Jesus went out of the house,
by the sea-side;	and sat by the sea-side;
and a great multitude gathered unto Him,	2. and great multitudes gathered unto Him,
so that He went up into a boat,	so that He went up into a boat,
and sat in the sea;	and sat;
and all the multitude was upon the land by the sea-side.	and all the multitude stood on the shore.
2. And He taught them many things in parables. . . .	3. And He taught them many things in parables. . . .

Plainly, it is the same general picture that we find in Lk. v, 1-3, as is drawn in the two passages of St. Mark and St. Matthew just quoted: Jesus is by the sea-side accompanied by such multitudes that to escape their presence He goes up into a boat from which He conveniently addresses them. Plainly too, in the drawing of that picture, Mk. and Mt. agree very closely with each other, whereas St. Luke presents wide differences from either of them. And the simple fact that these differences bear, as we have already shown, the distinct impress of Lk's style, goes far towards proving that in this, as in the preceding sections of our third Gospel, they are variations from the other two Synoptics. But further, the examination of these differences proves that the reasons for which they were introduced by St. Luke can still be pointed out.

Thus Lk's opening words "and it came to pass" are a general form of expression which he substitutes for the temporal connection found in Mk. "and again," and in Mt. "the same day," because by prefixing the scene in Mk. iv, and in Mt. xiii, to a narrative of the call of the first disciples which is recorded at an earlier stage by the first two Synoptists, St. Luke knows that he is doing away with Mk's and Mt's apparent chronological order of events. Mk's statement that Christ "began to teach," is naturally omitted by St. Luke,

who has already mentioned this *beginning* (cf. Luke iii, 23), and repeatedly described Jesus' teaching in various places (cf. Luke iv, 15, 31, 44). Our third Evangelist drops also Mt's mention that "Jesus went out of the house," because this "going out" appears to him sufficiently implied in Mk's and Mt's description of the scene by the *sea-side* which he borrows from them. He states that "the multitude pressed upon Him (Jesus) and heard the word of God" in order to set forth more distinctly what is given to understand in the expression "great multitudes gathered unto Him (Jesus) *so that* He went up into a boat," found in the other two Gospels. At this point, St. Luke begins to fuse the maritime scene in Mk. iv, 1-2a) and in Mt. xiii, 1-3a) with the one which in Mk. i, 16 sqq. and in Mt. iv, 18 sqq. is connceted with Our Lord's call of His early disciples. This is easily seen in his statement that Jesus "was standing by the lake of Gennesaret," wherein the general expression "was standing," which is equivalent to simply "being,"[24] brings into harmony Mk's and Mt's varying words παραγων (passing along by) and περιπατων (walking by), and wherein the distinctly Lucan appellation "the *lake* of Gennesaret" is used for Gentile readers[25] instead of the name "the *Sea* of Galilee" which suited Mk's and Mt's redaction:

Mk. 1, 16a: And passing along by the Sea of Galilee.
Mt. iv, 18a: And walking by the Sea of Galilee.
Lk. v, 1c: He was Himself standing by the lake of Gennesaret.

Whence it is only natural to look upon Lk's next verse,

Lk. v, 2.
and He saw two boats standing by the lake;
but the fishermen having gone out of them
were washing the nets,

as an intended equivalent of the lines which follow immediately in Mk. and Mt.:

Mk. i, 16b-d.	Mt. iv, 18b-d.
He saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon,	He saw two brothers, Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother,
casting in the Sea,	casting a net into the Sea,
for they were fishermen.	for they were fishermen.

As it is exactly the same action which our third evangelist found in Mk. and Mt. ascribed to Our Lord: "He saw," so he carefully

[24]The verb εἶναι used by St. Luke is simply a stronger form of ἑστώς, as is admitted by Crampon (*La Sainte Bible*) and Loisy (*Evangiles Synoptiques*).

[25]Cf. Josephus (*Antiquities of the Jews*, Book xviii, chap. ii, § 1; *Wars of the Jews*, Book iii, chap. x, § 1) who, as he writes for Gentile readers, speaks of the *lake* of Gennesaret.

preserved it in his opening words "and He saw," the conjunction "and" being added simply for the sake of connection with the preceding line:

> He was Himself standing by the lake of Gennesaret,
> *and* He saw . . .

As he next noticed Mt's variation from Mk's wording (Mt. has: "He saw *two brothers*," instead of Mk: "He saw"), so he availed himself of it to introduce a further variation of his own, and wrote: "He saw two *boats*," instead of Mt's reading: "He saw two *brothers*." He substituted the word "boats" for that in Mt's: "brother," because in the miraculous draught of fishes which he intended to record, he wished to speak explicitly only of Simon, that is of only one of the two brothers distinctly named by both St. Mark and St. Matthew:

> Mk. i, 16b: He saw Simon and Andrew, the brother of Simon.
> Mt. iv, 18b: He saw two brothers, Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother.
> Lk. v, 2a: He saw two boats.[26]

When St. Luke described the boats as "standing by the lake," he expressly stated what he knew to be implied in Mk's and Mt's records concerning Simon and Andrew. For by stating that Jesus "*saw*" these two brothers, that He "*said* to them: *Come* after Me and I *will make* you *fishers of men*," thus inviting them to another, more desirable, more fruitful kind of fishing, the first two Synoptists gave to understand that the night fishing was entirely over, and that the boats have been brought close to the shore.

Having thus handled Mk's and Mt's first line, our third Evangelist proceeded to utilize in a no less skilful manner the information contained in their next two lines. He took notice that Mk. and Mt. spoke first of the present occupation of Simon and Andrew (Mk. "casting in the Sea;" Mt. "casting a net into the Sea"), and next of their avocation ("for they were fishermen"). This order was (as may be readily seen) no longer available after St. Luke had modified Mk's and Mt's first line into "He saw two boats standing by the lake." In consequence, our third Evangelist inverted it,[27] and mentioned first the avocation of Simon and Andrew, and only then their present occupation:

---

[26]St. Luke all the more readily introduced this reading because ke knew that the presence of *two boats* not far from each other is implied in Mk's and Mt's accounts of Christ's call of the early disciples.

[27]For similar inversions in St. Luke's Gospel, see THE NEW YORK REVIEW, vol. I., p. 361 sqq.; p. 653 sqq.

Lk. v, 2b,c.
but the fishermen having gone out of them,
were washing the nets.

In "the fishermen" here, St. Luke has no others in view but Simon and Andrew; for he knows that in Mk's and Mt's accounts of Our Lord's calling of the early disciples, they are the only two spoken of as "fishermen" (Mk. i, 16c; Mt. iv, 18c), the only ones too invited to become "fishers of men" (Mk. i, 17d); Mt. iv, 19b.[28] As in these same accounts he has noticed that Simon and Andrew are the only ones described as "straightway leaving the nets" to follow Jesus (Mk. i, 18; Mt. iv, 20) St. Luke takes this to imply that the two disciples were not then in the boats, and hence he states explicitly that "the fishermen had gone out of them" already. When he next speaks of the present occupation of the fishermen he rightly interprets Mk's casting in the Sea," and Mk's "casting a net into the Sea" as refering to an occupation which naturally followed on the night fishing: Mk. and Mt. could not mean that Simon and Andrew were actually casting the net to catch fish; they rather meant that the casting of the net was for the purpose of washing their implements; and in consequence, our third Evangelist describes the fishermen as "washing the nets."[29]

St. Luke's next verse runs as follows:

Lk. v, 3.
But having gone into one of the boats, which was Simon's,
He asked him to put out a little from the land,
and sitting down He taught the multitudes from the boat.

In it, our third Evangelist obviously comes back to the scene with which St. Mk. and St. Mt. introduce the delivery of Our Lord's parables, and part of which he has already utilized:

Mk. iv, 1-2a.	Mt. xiii, 1-3a
1. And again He began to teach	1. The same day, Jesus went out of the house,
by the sea-side;	and sat by the sea-side;
and a great multitude gathered unto Him,	2. and great multitudes gathered unto Him,
so that He went up into a boat,	so that He went up into a boat,
and sat in the Sea.	and sat;

[28]That St. Luke meant by "the fishermen" only Simon and Andrew was realized in the second century of our era by Tatian who took Lk's ἁλεεῖς as corresponding to a *dual* form in Syriac: hence the English rendering "while the *two* fishers who were gone out of them" in H. W. Hogg's of Tatian's *Diatessaron*.

[29]This view of Lk. v, 2, disposes of the minor differences noticed above in connection with that verse between our third Evangelist and the other two Synoptists.

and all the multitude was upon the land by the sea-side.	and all the multitude stood on the shore.
2. And He taught them many things in parables. . . .	3. And He taught them many things in parables. . . .[30]

In the opening line: "but having gone into one of the boats, which was Simon's," St. Luke borrows from Mk. iv, and Mt. xiii, the statement "He went up into a boat" which is indeed the one coming next to that which he has already borrowed from them, viz.: that Jesus was hard pressed by surrounding multitudes. He adapts it, however, to his own preceding context: "He saw *two boats*," by writing: "He went up into *one of the boats*." When he adds to it: "which was Simon's," he ascribes the ownership of that particular boat to one of "the fishermen" he had in mind when writing his preceding verse. But more especially he mentions Simon's name in view of his future insertion of the miraculous draught of fishes in which Simon Peter was plainly the hero. It is also for the purpose of preparing his readers for the narrative of this great miracle that St. Luke subjoins at once Christ's direction to Simon whom he has just named: "He asked him to put out a little from the land" (Lk. v, 3b). Then, as he has brought Jesus to the same place "in the sea" as is assigned to Him in Mk. and Mt., our third Evangelist embodies in one line: "And sitting down He taught the multitudes from the boat" (Lk. v, 3c) the remainder of the information contained in his documents:

Mk. iv.	Mt. xiii.
and sat in the sea.	and sat;
And all the multitude was upon the land by the sea-side.	and all the multitude stood on the shore.
And He taught them many things in parables. . . .	And He thought them many things in parables. . . . "

After his introductory scene, St. Luke proceeds to record the miraculous draught of fishes, an event which, as we already stated, has no equivalent in either of the first two Gospels, and the narrative of which we now need to consider only to point out the manner in which our third Evangelist inserted it into Mk's and Mt's accounts of the call of the early disciples. The miracle is narrated as follows in Lk. v, 4-9:

4. But when He had left speaking, He said to Simon:
   Put out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.
5. And Simon answering said:
   Master, having toiled the whole night, we have taken nothing;
   but at Thy word I will let down the nets.

[30] St. Luke omits the reference in Mk. and Mt. to Our Lord's *parables*, because he intends to record the parables later and in a somewhat different conncetion (Lk. viii).

6. And having done this, they inclosed a great multitude of fishes,
   and their nets were breaking.
7. And they beckoned to their partners in the other boat
   to come and help them; and they came,
   and filled both the boats so that they were sinking.
8. But Simon Peter seeing it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying:
   Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.
9. For amazement seized him and all who were with him,
   at the draught of the fishes which they had taken.

In its separate state, this narrative apparently began with the words "*Jesus* said to Simon" which St. Luke modified into "*He* said to Simon" consistently with his redaction of the introductory scene wherein he never mentions the name of Jesus, and to which he prefixed the phrase "But when He had left speaking" as a fitting connection with his preceding verse wherein he represents Christ addressing the multitudes from Simon's boat. In its separate state too, the narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes ended naturally with Lk's present verse 9:

> For amazement seized him and all that were with him,
> at the draught of the fishes which they had taken.

St. Luke did not modify this verse, but he availed himself of its expression: "all that were with him," to name at once the second set of brothers who besides Simon and Andrew were, according to Mk. and Mt., the early disciples of Jesus:

Lk. iv, 10.

> And in like manner also, James and John, sons of Zebedee,
> who were Simon's partners. . . .

He thus mentions distinctly James and John, because they were so mentioned in Mk's and Mt's accounts of Christ's call of His first disciples. And he speaks of them as "Simon's partners" because this seemed to our third Evangelist a natural inference from the statement in these same accounts that James and John were "in the boat" of Zebedee, as compared with the information embodied in the narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes: "And they (Simon and Andrew) beckoned to their partners in the other boat" (Lk. v, 7).

After this mention of James and John, St. Luke writes:

Lk. v, 10.

> . . . And Jesus said to Simon:
> Fear not; henceforth thou shalt catch men.

This statement of our third Evangelist reminds us forcibly of the *second* verse in Mk's and Mt's narratives of the call of the early disciples:

Mk. i, 17.	Mt. iv, 19.
And Jesus said to them: Come unto Me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.	And He saith to them: Come after Me, and I will make you fishers of men.

Its wording and contents bring us back to the exact point where St. Luke had left utilizing the text of those narratives in framing the scene introductory to his record of the miraculous draught of fishes. For as we have shown above, this introductory scene was framed by Lk's skilful combination of the data in Mk. iv, 1-2a, and in Mt. xiii, 1-3a, with the text of the *first* verse in Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22. There are, it is true, considerable differences in wording between the second part of Lk. v, 10, and the parallel verse in Mk. and in Mt. But they can be easily accounted for by Lk's careful handling of the text of the other two Synoptists. Differently from Mk. and Mt., our third evangelist makes Our Lord address Simon alone: "And Jesus said to *Simon* . . . ," because on the one hand Christ's words were directed according to Mk. and Mt., not to John and James, but to Simon and Andrew;[31] and because on the other, Simon alone, to the exclusion of Andrew, is named in Lk's narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes. Next St. Luke inserts at once the words: "Fear not," especially in view of Peter's recent expression of fear: "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord" (Lk. v, 8b). Peter's fear was so great that it needed to be calmed without delay. Our third Evangelist made therefore this addition to Mk's and Mt's parallel clause, because it was practically required by his record of the miraculous draught of fishes. As regards Lk's following sentence: "Henceforth, thou shalt catch men," it is plainly a modified equivalent of Mk's and Mt's: "Come after Me, and I will make you [to become] fishers of men." Lk's expression "henceforth" (απο του νυν) is naturally substituted for "Come after Me," a phrase no longer fully suited in addressing one, who, like Peter, was at Jesus' knees. Besides, "henceforth," especially when coupled with the words: "thou shalt catch men," conveys sufficiently the idea that the Master wants Peter in His company to fit him for the fishing of men. Finally, if St. Luke writes "thou shalt catch men" instead of "I will make you *fishers of men*," it is because writing for Gentile readers he deems it advisable to give a plain equivalent of the original paronomasia preserved in the other two Synoptics.

[31] Had Luke v, 10, read:

> And in like manner also, James and John, sons of Zebedee, who were Simon's partners. And Jesus said to *them*,

the personal pronoun (them) would have naturally included James and John.

Lk's concluding verse runs as follows:

Lk. v, 11.
And having brought the boats to land,

It bears, as might be naturally expected the manifest impress of St. Luke's redactory work; our third Evangelist worded it in view of the two distinct conclusions with which the other two Synoptists bring to an end the distinct calls, first of Simon and Andrew, next of James and John:

Mk. i, 18.	Mt. iv, 20.
And straightway leaving the nets, they followed Him.	But they straightway leaving the nets followed Him.
Mk. i, 20bc.	Mt. iv, 22.
And leaving their father, Zebedee in the boat with the hired men, they went away after Him.	But they straightway leaving the boat and their father, followed Him.

Under St. Luke's pen the plural forms καταγαγοντες αφεντες (subducentes, relinquentes, secuti sunt) found in verse 11, include not only James, John and Simon mentioned in the preceding verse, but also Andrew, whose presence is implied, as we have shown, in the expression "the fishermen" in verse 2, and in several plural forms found in our Evangelist's record of the miraculous draught of fishes (verses 4, 5, 6, 7). In writing his concluding verse St. Luke has therefore in view *all* the early disciples, the first group of whom (Simon and Andrew) is meant by Mk. i, 15, and by Mt. iv, 20, and the second group (James and John) by Mk. i, 20b,c, and by Mt. iv. 22. And it is the same conduct that he ascribes to them all as is described in connection with each of their respective groups in the two sets of verses of Mk. and Mt.: in Lk. v, 11, as in Mk. i, 18, Mt. iv, 20, and in Mk. i, 20, bc, Mt. iv, 22, the early disciples give up every thing to follow Jesus. Again, it is because he combines Mk's and Mt's information concerning the conduct of each group of Christ's early disciples that St. Luke omits the particulars "leaving *the nets*," "leaving *the boat and their father*," mentioned by the other two Synoptists in reference to each group separately, and prefers the general expression "having left *all*." It may also be noticed that by using only one concluding formula our third Synoptist was in full harmony with the documents before him, since the two separate conclusions in Mk. and Mt. are but one and the same formula repeated with such changes as were required by the respective circumstances of each of the two groups mentioned by them. Finally, as this one formula was modified

by St. Mark and St. Matthew in accordance with the respective circumstances of their two groups of early disciples, St. Luke was fully justified in adding a further modification: "having brought the boats to land," as required by the present circumstances of those same disciples who had just hauled a great multitude of fishes from "the deep."

VII. General Differences in Lk. V, 1-11 Explained.

The intimate dependence on the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew which we have traced throughout Lk. v, 1-11, accounts indeed for all its minor variations from the parallel narratives of the call of Our Lord's early disciples in our first two Synoptists. But it leaves unexplained some great differences connected with Lk. v, 1-11, and thus far only incidentally referred to.

The most outstanding of these differences is Lk's insertion of the narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes. As this miracle is nowhere recorded in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew, St. Luke probably narrated it with a view to complete our first two Evangelists, for completeness was one of the aims of his Gospel: "The *former* treatise I made, O Theophilus, of *all things* which Jesus began to do and to teach" (Acts i, 1). In the primitive Church, Peter, James and John, were considered as pre-eminently its pillars (Galat. ii, 9), and in harmony with this, only these three disciples are mentioned by name in Lk's account of the miraculous draught of fishes. Furthermore, Simon Peter plays the first part in this account consistently with the highest rank assigned to that apostle by Our Lord Himself, and distinctly recognized by the early Christians. Andrew's name may have been more particularly omitted by St. Luke, because our third Evangelist was aware of the tradition embodied in St. John's Gospel (i, 40-42) which told of Andrew coming to Jesus before Peter, and in fact "bringing him to Jesus." Of course, once Andrew's name was excluded, St. Luke had to represent Our Lord's words as directed to Peter alone.

To combine the narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes with that of Christ's call of the early disciples appeared to St. Luke a most natural thing, for Jesus promise to make Simon and Andrew of "fishermen," "fishers of men," could be best reported immediately after the record of their fruitless night fishing. And besides, the insertion of this miracle just before the final call of Christ's ea disciples suited perfectly the general apologetical purpose of our third

Evangelist (cf. Lk. i, 4): in presence of such an amazing draught of fishes the early disciples were plainly justified in relying on Our Lord's promise concerning the future, and in leaving everything to obey His call.[32]

The second great difference offered by Lk. v, 1-11, regards the place which St. Luke assigns to his narrative of the call of the first disciples. As we have seen, he deliberately gives that narrative at a later stage in the long series of incidents which is common to him and to our second Evangelist . (Compare Mk. i, 16-iii, 6, with Lk. iv, 31-vi, 11). How is this to be accounted for? Briefly as follows. Differently from St. Mark, St. Luke places a certain number of those incidents *before* the call of the early disciples, because of two well-ascertained facts: (1) all such anticipated incidents are, in both Mk. and Lk., most closely bound up with Our Lord's residence in Capharnaum; (2) for reasons set forth in our last Study,[33] our third Evangelist has made this residence consequent on Jesus' rejection at Nazareth. Now as differently from St. Mark, he had already mentioned Christ's rejection from His own city before the call of the disciples, he had also to record before it all the events which were inseparably connected with Jesus' residence at Capharnaum, and hence to invert the place assigned to them in St. Mark's Gospel. In fact, in thus altering Mk's order, he acted in deep agreement with St. Matthew's Gospel which tells of Our Lord's residence in Capharnaum just before it records the call of the early disciples (cf. Mt. iv. 18-22).

The last great peculiarity of Lk. v, 1-11, which remains to be explained consists in the fusion it presents of the maritime scene in Mk. iv, 1-2a, and Mt. xiii, 1-3a, with the opening verses of Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22. St. Luke blended these passages with a view to frame a scene that would fittingly introduce the narrative of the draught of fishes which he intended to insert into Mk's and Mt's accounts of Christ's call of His first disciples. The picture of Our Lord addressing the multitudes from a boat which is drawn in Mk. iv, 1 sq., and in Mt. xiii, 1 sqq., as preliminary to His delivery of parables, was undoubtedly well-suited for St. Luke's purpose. It described a scene on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, in several respects

[32]As regards the source from which St. Luke drew his narrative of the miraculous draught of fishes, nothing can now be defined with certainty. Apparently, the great miracle was not recorded in the documents used for the composition of our first two Gospels. The question of the probable source utilized by St. Luke will be studied later on.

[33]Cf. THE NEW YORK REVIEW, vol. I, p. 656 (Feb.-March, 1906).

similar to the one with which Mk. and Mt. introduce the call of the first disciples. Besides, St. Luke knew that it was not necessarily to be connected with the delivery of the parables, since, at least in St. Matthew (xiii), it is prefixed to parables delivered under various circumstances and at different times. Finally, its combination with Mk's and Mt's narratives of the call of Christ's early disciples was naturally suggested to our third Evangelist because it represented the multitudes as clinging to the footsteps of Jesus: this representation agreed perfectly with a similar one in his immediately preceding section (Lk. iv, 42-44), and also with Mk's statement to practically the same effect in a section of his (Mk. i, 35-39) clearly parallel to Lk. iv, 42-44. (Notice in particular, the expression "*all* seek Thee," in Mk. i, 37).

VIII. Concluding Remarks. The foregoing study of Mk. i, 16-20, Mt. iv, 18-22, and Lk. v, 1-11, suggests some general conclusions which may be briefly stated as follows:

(1) These three passages are certainly parallel and narrate the same final call of Christ's early disciples;

(2) St. Mark's narrative is primitive in comparison with the other two; next comes St. Matthew's record which depends on our second Synoptist; and last is St. Luke's account which utilizes the text of both St. Mark and St. Matthew;

(3) St. Luke's narrative is the outcome of a combination by our third Evangelist of data found in Mk's and Mt's accounts of the call of the early disciples, (1) with the opening scene with which Mk. iv, and Mt. xiii, introduce Our Lord's delivery of the parables; and (2) with the record of the miraculous draught of fishes which is nowhere mentioned in our first two Gospels;

Lastly, (4) this combination explains St. Luke's variations from Mk. i, 16-20, and Mt. iv, 18-22, and it was effected by our third Synoptist in a deep and constant harmony with the data supplied by the first two Evangelists.

Francis E. Gigot.

THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE FATHERS.

The Fathers did not write didactic treatises on the Eucharist; but they touched on it in a great variety of forms in occasional writings of a practical nature, such as instructions for neophytes, and especially in polemical works, in which they make use of the doctrine of the Real Presence to combat heresy.

In order to understand the allusions which the Fathers make to the Eucharist, it will be of advantage to group them according to their ages and historical surroundings. On this basis they will fall into seven classes:

(1)—Writers who draw their inspiration from St. John: the author of the *Didache* and St. Ignatius of Antioch.

(2)—The adversaries of Gnosticism in the West: St. Justin, St. Irenæus, Tertullian, (to whom we may add his disciple, St. Cyprian).

(3)—The School of Alexandria: (*a*) in the Third Century: Clement and Origen; (*b*) in the Fourth Century: St. Athanasius and the Cappadocians—SS. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa.

(4)—The Fathers of the School of Antioch in the Fourth Century: St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. John Chrysostom, Theodoret.

(5)—The opponents of Arianism in the West: St. Hilary of Poitiers and St. Ambrose.

(6)—Those who took part in the Christological controversies: Nestorius, and St. Cyril of Alexandria; the Monophysites, and Theodoret; and Pope St. Leo I.

(7)—St. Augustine and his followers of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries.

I. WRITINGS OF JOHANNINE INSPIRATION.

The *Didache* and the Epistles of St. Ignatius seem to have close relations with the Gospel of St. John, and may be considered as forming with it a group of writings which were almost contemporaneous. They probably proceed from the same surroundings; at any rate their expressions concerning the Eucharist are strikingly similar.

The Didache. This early document does not contain any testimony about the Real Presence; it witnesses only to the use made of

THE CALL OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES.

Mk. i. 16-20.

16. And passing along by the Sea of Galilee,
He saw Simon and Andrew, the brother of Simon,
casting in the sea,
for they were fishermen.

17. And Jesus said to them: Come after Me,
and I will make you become fishers of men.
18. And straightway leaving the nets
they followed Him.
19. And having gone forward a little,
He saw James, the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother,
them also in the boat
mending the nets;
20. and straightway He called them.
And leaving their father, Zebedee, in a boat
with the hired men, they went away after Him.

Mt. iv. 18-22.

18. But walking by the Sea of Galilee
He saw two brothers, Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother,
casting a net into the sea,
for they were fishermen.

19. And He saith to them: Come after Me,
and I will make you fishers of men.
20. But they straightway leaving the nets
followed Him.
21. And having gone on from thence,
He saw two other brothers, James the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother,
in the boat with Zebedee, their father,
mending their nets;
and He called them.
22. But they straightway leaving the boat and their father,
followed Him.

the Eucharist at the time it was written. The Eucharistic references in the *Didache* which are generally cited are found in cc. 9, 10; 14, 15 It is the unanimous opinion that the Eucharist is referred to in cc. 14-15: "Every Lord's day do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanks after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. But let no one who is at variance with his fellow come together with you, until they be reconcled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: In every place and time offer to me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations." It is difficult to see anything but a Eucharistic assembly in this gathering on Sundays for breaking bread and giving thanks, with the requirement of confession of sins so that the offering may be pure. Note the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, indicated by the word θυσια, and the reference to the text of Malachi i, 11; also the mention made of episcopoi and deacons in connection with the Eucharist.

There is not equal harmony among the authors as to whether cc. 9, 10, bear on the Eucharist. According to Dr. Funk,[1] the prayers of c. 9 are Eucharistic; they are, however, rather prayers, or, as we now say, "acts" recited before Communion, than a prayer of consecration—which accounts for the fact that we do not find in them the words of consecration. As for the prayer in c. 10, it refers to the Agape, which in apostolic times always accompanied the Eucharist. It is a prayer of thanksgiving to be made after the Agape. Mgr. Batiffol who does not admit the existence of the Agape in the First Century, would interpret both chapters as referring to the Eucharist. The reason why they do not contain the formula of consecration is simply because they do not describe the Eucharistic consecration. We should consider them as "two examples of the prayers improvised by the episcopos or the prophet in connection with the breaking of the bread, prayers which later became crystallized, and in our days form the 'Canon of the Mass.'"[2] Others[3] are of opinion that these prayers

[1] *Opera Patr. Apost.*, Vol. I, pp. clix, ff. Tübingen, 1887. Cf. Frankland, *The Early Eucharist*, p. 70: "We venture to urge . . . that the *Didache* does not contain a form of celebration of the Eucharist, but a set of thanksgiving prayers for silent use thereat by lay members of the Church."

[2] *Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive*, 2ième série: *L'Eucharistie*, pp. 105 ff. Paris, 1905.

[3] M. Ladeuze, Professor of Church History in the University of Louvain, in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 1902, pp. 339 ff.

have reference to repasts in the early Church, of a liturgical character indeed, but quite different from the Eucharist. In c. 9 we have the prayers before, and in c. 10 the prayers after the repast, much the same as our modern grace before and after meals.

St. Ignatius of Antioch. In his epistles, St. Ignatius makes very evident allusion to the Eucharist in a way which supposes faith in the Real Presence among the Christians he is addressing. He makes use of the Eucharist against the error of Docetism as a witness to the reality of the human nature of Christ. To the Smyrnæans,[4] he writes: "They (the Docetæ) absent themselves from thanksgiving and prayer because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of Our Savior, Jesus Christ,[5] which suffered on behalf of our sins, and which of His goodness the Father raised."[6] And to the Ephesians:[7] "Let me hear that you all meet together in one in the faith of Christ, who is both Son of God and Son of man, and that you are obedient to your bishops and presbyters, breaking one bread which is the medicine of immortality[8] and the antidote to secure that we do not die, but live in Christ continually."

St. Ignatius, like St. Paul, (I Cor. xv,) does not conceive the immortality of man without the resurrection of the body. Since the Eucharist has a special virtue to restore life to the body, it secures the immortality of man and the perpetuity of his spiritual life in Jesus Christ. This is in accordance with the Johannine tradition: "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up on the last day;" and a most effective argument against the erroneous eschatology of the Docetæ who denied the resurrection of the flesh. Later on we shall find the same argument used for the same purpose by Irenæus and Tertullian.

[4] *Ad Smyrn.* 7.

[5] "As to how the elements are related to the body and the blood of Christ, Ignatius seems to have expressed himself in a strictly realistic way (*Smyrn.* 7: σάρκα τοῦ σωτῆρος). But many passages show that Ignatius was far from such a conception and rather thought as John did." Harnack, *History of Dogma*, I, 211. "Thinking as John did" might seem sufficiently realistic to suit most of us.

[6] Lightfoot's comment is: "The Eucharist implies the reality of Christ's flesh. To those who deny this reality it has no meaning at all; to them Christ's words of institution are false; it is in no sense the flesh of Christ." But the words of Ignatius justify a stronger interpretation: that he is affirming that the Eucharist is the flesh of Christ, the *same* which suffered and was raised. For a somewhat different interpretation see Batiffol, l. c., pp. 129, 130.

[7] *Ad Eph.*, 20, 2.

[8] The Council of Trent (Sess. xiii, c. 2) calls the Eucharist "antidotum quo liberemur a culpis quotidianis."

The heretics of Ignatius' time broke the bond of unity, and their schism constituted a real peril to the Church. Hence he constantly exhorts the faithful to remain united to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons from whom they will receive the true doctrine of Jesus Christ. He sees in the Eucharist the symbol as well as the true bond of union; the Church must be one, for there is one Eucharist, one Flesh of Our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup for union in his blood. "Make it your business then to use one Eucharist; for there is one flesh of Our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto union of His blood; one altar as there is one bishop, together with the presbyters and deacons my fellow-slaves; so that whereinsoever you act, you may act according to God."[9] St. Ignatius sees in the Eucharist such an expressive symbol of the oneness of faith and love which must bring the faithful together, that in a fearless metaphor[10] he does not hesitate to call the flesh of Christ faith and His blood love. "Do you therefore take up meekness and revive yourselves in faith which is flesh of the Lord, and in love which is blood of Jesus Christ."[11] Finally, writing to the Romans and speaking of his great desire to be united to Christ after his death, he considers the Eucharist as the symbol of heavenly bliss when he shall be united to Christ forever. "All my earthly longings have been crucified. There is no more any flame of passion in me but living water which speaks and summons me to the Father. I have no delight in corruptible food or in this life's pleasure. I desire the bread of God[12] which is the flesh of Christ the son of David, and his blood which is imperishable love."[13]

To sum up: St. Ignatius considers the Eucharist (1) as containing really the body and blood of Christ; (2) as the symbol of the oneness

[9] *Philadel.* 4. On this passage cf. I Cor. x, 17: "For we being many are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread." Also *Didache*, 9.

[10] "This is one of Ignatius' fearless metaphors which he does not scruple to employ in addressing Churchmen thoroughly familiar with Eucharistic practice and Eucharistic doctrine. . . . He writes in perfect freedom with confidence of a sympathetic hearing which would ensure his not being misunderstood." Frankland, l. c., p. 61.

[11] *Trall.* 8, 1.

[12] "Contextus docet, Ignatium de unione cum Christo vel de Dei fruitione in cælo loqui, cujus martyrio se participem fieri sperat; imagines autem quibus utitur de eucharistia desumptæ sunt." Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, I, p. 1261. 1901. Does not H. B. Swete exaggerate somewhat when he says, referring to *Tral.* 8; *Rom.* 7: "In . . . . contexts where the Docetæ are not in view, he allows himself to use language scarcely less ambiguous than that of the *Didache*. . . . The tendency appears . . . to spiritualize the words of institution so far as to obscure their reference to His actual Flesh and Blood." *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1902, p. 168.

[13] The whole passage is inspired by the Fourth Gospel. Cf. especially John iv, 10, 11; vi, 51.

of the faith and love which unite the members of the Church; (3) in a certain sense as the symbol and pledge of the consummation of our union with Christ in Heaven.

II. THE OPPONENTS OF GNOSTICISM IN THE WEST.

Like Ignatius these writers found "in the Eucharist a weapon to slay heresy. The false gnosis sought to divorce the spiritual from the material and the divine from the created. Against this disruption the Eucharist is a standing witness."[14]

St. Justin. In the days of St. Justin, the church had to contend with a twofold difficulty. In the first place, Christians were made the object of all sorts of calumnious attacks. They were accused of atheism, incest, of renewing in their ceremonies of initiation and other liturgical solemnities the crime of Thyestes.[15] St. Justin alludes to these charges in both of his Apologies.[16] He considered that the best way to refute them was to describe in all simplicity the two im-important Christian rites—baptism and eucharist. His description of the latter rite[17] contains a clear testimony in favor of the Real Presence. He identifies the eucharistic food with the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Word, that same flesh and blood which He took for our salvation. "In like manner as Jesus Christ our Savior having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word . . . is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."[18]

Moreover Justin bases his doctrine of the Real Presence on the words of Christ at the Last Supper, and clings to a literal interpretation of those words: "For the Apostles in the memoirs composed by them which are called Gospels have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined on them: that Jesus took bread and when he had given thanks said, 'This do in remembrance of Me, this is My body;' and gave it to them alone."[19]

From the same chapters we learn that in Justin's time the liturgy of the Mass was already constituted in its main lines. The Agape

[14]H. B. Swete, l. c., p. 170.

[15]This charge of child-murder is vividly presented by Minutius Felix, *Octavius*, 9. Tertullian alludes to the same calumny (*Apol.* 7).

[16]*I Apol.* 26; *II Apol.* 12.

[17]*I Apol.* 65-67.

[18]*I Apol.* 66

[19]*Ibid.*

was no longer in existence. Sunday was the day chosen for the meeting. The Apostolic or Prophetic Scriptures are read, followed by a homily. Then prayer is offered up; the oblation follows—the bread and wine and water. The president utters the prayer of consecration to which the people answer: Amen. Communion is received under both species ; and the eucharist is carried to the absent brethren by the hands of the deacons.

The second difficulty referred to above came from the Jews, who still insisted that the Mosaic religion was indispensable for salvation. Treating this difficulty in his *Dialogue with Trypho*,[20] Justin argues that the sacrifices of the Old Law are abolished and replaced by the Eucharist. The latter is the sacrifice foretold by the prophet Malachi.[21] It is a memorial of the Incarnation and the Passion of the Savior.[22] It is a sacrifice of thanksgiving which purifies the soul and overthrows the power of the demon.

Thus St. Justin continues the tradition of St. Ignatius and explicitly teaches the Real Presence. For him the Eucharistic Bread is "the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus," just as for St. Ignatius the Eucharist is "the flesh which suffered for our sins and which the Father raised." And we shall find in St. Irenæus statements no less striking for their realism.[23]

St. Irenæus. This holy doctor makes use of the Eucharist in refuting the Gnostics, especially the Valentinians and the Marcionites, who taught the existence of two gods—one the God of the Old Testament and the Creator of matter—the principle of evil; and the other—the God of the New Testament and the Father of Christ—the source of goodness. Since they considered matter to be evil, they denied the reality of the flesh of Christ (Docetism) and the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. They also asserted an antagonism between the Old Testament and the New, ascribing them to two different and adverse Principles. Against each of these three errors, St. Irenæus makes use of arguments drawn from the Eucharist.

Against their Docetism he makes use of it as an *argumentum ad hominem*, evidencing that his adversaries as well as himself believed in the Real Presence. His line of argument may be summarized thus: you believe in the Eucharist; now in the Eucharist there is the real

[20] See Turmel on *St. Justin*, New York Review, 1905, pp. 470, 471.

[21] *Dial.* 41, 116, 117.

[22] *Dial.* 41, 70.

[23] For a comparison between the testimony of Irenæus and that of Justin see Frankland, l. c., p. 79, 80; also Batiffol, 162, 163.

flesh and blood of Jesus Christ; therefore Jesus Christ has a real body, and accordingly, God, who is the Father of Jesus Christ, is the same as the God of the Old Testament, who created matter.

"How will they be assured that this bread over which thanks have been given, is the body of their Lord and that the cup contains His blood, if they do not say that He is the son of the Creator of the world (the God of the Old Testament, the Creator of matter) that is His Word, by which trees bear fruit, and fountains flow, and the earth gives first fruit, then afterwards the ear, then the full corn in the ear.?"[24]

The same reasoning is also to be found in another passage: "For if He were indeed from another Father, how could the Lord rightly take bread of the same nature as ourselves, and declare it to be His body, and affirm that the mixed cup was His blood?"[25] Irenæus thus proves by the Real Presence that Jesus has a real human body, the gift of the God of the Old Testament, the Creator of the material world.

By it he proves also the resurrection of the flesh, which was denied by the Gnostics. How could they imagine the flesh to be incapable of sharing in the divine life in face of the fact that it is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord? Or, in His own words: "How can they assert that the flesh is destined to corruption and does not partake of life, since it is nourished with the body of the Lord and with His blood? Either they must change their views or renounce their oblations. But our view (of the resurrection of the flesh) is consonant with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirms our view. We offer to God His own, thus fittingly announcing fellowship and union of flesh and spirit. For as bread from the earth when it receives the invocation of God is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two things, both an earthly and an heavenly, so also our bodies, partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have the hope of the resurrection to eternity."[26]

The above comparison between the consecration of the bread by the invocation of God and the bestowing, through the Eucharist, of a seed of resurrection in our own bodies is not, it must be granted, a very happy one. But we must not lose sight of the fact that at the time the doctrine of the eucharistic conversion had not yet developed.

[24] *Adv. Hær.* iv, 18, 4.
[25] *Ibid.* iv, 33, 2.
[26] *Ibid.* iv, 18, 5.

A strenuous vindication of the resurrection as due to the Eucharist is to be found further on in the same treatise:

"When both the mixed cup and the bread receive the word of God and the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ, and from these the essence of our flesh is nourished and sustained: how can they assert that the flesh is not receptive of the gift of God which is life everlasting, seeing that it is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord, and is a member of him. And in what manner the wood of the vine laid in the soil in its proper season bears fruit, and as the grain of wheat falling into the soil and dissolved, is raised manifold through the spirit of God who upholds all things; and as these then through the wisdom of God come to men's use and receiving the word of God become Eucharist, which is body and blood of Christ, so also our bodies being nourished from the Eucharist, and put into the ground and dissolved in it, shall rise again in their proper season, when the word of God vouchsafes awakening to them, unto the glory of our God and Father."[27]

Against the view of the Marcionites that there was an opposition between the Old and the New Covenant, he shows that the pure sacrifice foretold in the Old Testament is fulfilled in the New.

"Christ giving to His disciples directions to offer first fruits to God from His creatures—not as to one who stands in need, but so that they may be neither unfruitful nor ungrateful—He took bread which is of creation and gave thanks, saying: 'This is My body.' And the cup likewise, which is of the same creation as ourselves, He confessed to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the new Covenant; and this the Church received from the Apostles and offers throughout the whole world to God, to Him who affords us food, as first fruits of His gifts in the New Covenant, of which among the twelve Prophets, Malachi thus foreshadowed: 'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Almighty Lord' . . . very evidently meaning by these words that whereas the former people shall cease to offer to God, yet in every place sacrifice will be offered to Him, and that a pure one: His name is made glorious among the nations."[28]

Tertullian. In his treatise *Adversus Marcionem*, Tertullian refutes the same opponents as St. Irenæus and uses the same arguments. But while he finds in the Eucharist a means of refuting heresy, he does not seem at first glance to accept so clearly the Real Presence.

[27] *Ibid.* v, 2, 3.
[28] *Ibid.* iv, 17, 4-5.

Speaking of the elements used by Christ for our sanctification (water, oil, and bread) he says[29] that Christ "makes His body present by means of bread, panem quo ipsum corpus suum repræsentat." *Repræsentare* in Tertullian means *to make actually present over again.* Thus the second advent of Christ is called *secunda repræsentatio.*[30]

Replying to Marcion, who denied the material reality of Christ's human body, he quotes some prophecies of the Old Testament, announcing the life and death of Christ. Among others he quotes Psalms xcv, 10: "Dominus regnavit a ligno;" then Jer. xi, 19: "Venite mittamus lignum in panem ejus—scilicet," Tertullian explains, "crucem in corpus ejus." Our Lord, he says, explained this prophecy at the last Supper when He made the bread, "the figure of His body."[31] "According to our former prophecy he was to reign from the tree as Lord. This tree it is which Jeremias likewise gives you intimation of, when he prophesies to the Jews, who should say: Come let us destroy the tree with the fruit (the bread) thereof, that is, His body. For so did God in your own gospel (Luke) even reveal the sense, when He called His body bread, so that for the time to come, you may understand that He has given to His body the figure of bread whose body the prophet of old figuratively turned into bread, the Lord Himself designing to give by and by an interpretation of the mystery." Tertullian's reasoning seems to imply a symbolic concept of the Eucharist. Jeremias saw in the bread a figure of the crucified body of Christ. Now Our Lord explained this prophecy when he said at the Last Supper that the bread is the figure of His body. But a thorough investigation of the text, as well as of the aim Tertullian had in view,

[29] *Adv. Marcion.* i, 14.

[30] *Ibid.* iii, 7. A complete list of the instances where Tertullian employs this word may be found in the work of M. d'Alès on *La théologie de Tertullien,* p. 356-359. He gives a strong argument to prove that it is not symbolic. Such too is the conclusion of Mgr. Batiffol, l. c., p. 222: "*Repræsentare* n'a rien de symbolique." H. B. Swete, however, says: "It has been argued from Tertullian's use of *repræsentare* that in the last mentioned passage he intends to assert the actual presence of the Lord's Body in or by means of the Eucharistic bread. The verb is capable of yielding this meaning, but it is equally susceptible of another. *Repræsentare* is to make present to mind or eye what has been hitherto unseen or has passed out of sight: whether the presence is actual or not must be determined in each case by the context. The verb and its derivatives are favorites with Tertullian. In rather more than half the instances where he employs them, actual restoration is intended. But this is not by any means its invariable use. In view of Tertullian's general attitude towards the question of the Eucharistic Gift, it is more natural to understand it here in its weaker sense. Tertullian seems to have been satisfied with a virtual identification of the Eucharist with the body and blood of Christ." (l. c., p. 173).

[31] *Adv. Marc.* iii, 19.

will convince us that the means bread in general in which he saw a prophetic figure of Christ's body. If he mentions the last supper, it is simply in order to affirm that Our Lord fulfilled the Old Testament, and not to declare that the eucharistic bread is only the figure of Christ's body. Tertullian here does not advance any eucharistic theory; he simply comments on the scriptures after his allegorical fashion.[32]

The same remark applies to another famous passage[33] in which many have claimed to find a symbolic theory of the Eucharist.

"(Christ) earnestly expressed his desire to eat the passover. . . . Then, having taken bread and given it to His disciples, he made it his own body by saying, 'This is My body,' that is, the figure of my body. A figure, however, there could not have been, unless there were first a veritable body. An empty thing, or phantom, is incapable of a figure. If, however, (as Marcion might say) He pretended the bread was His body, because He lacked the truth of bodily substance, it follows that He must have given bread for us. . . . But why call His body bread? Marcion did not understand how ancient was this figure of the body of Christ, who said Himself by Jeremias: They devised a device against me saying: Let us cast the tree upon His bread, which means, of course, the cross upon His body. And thus casting light, as He always did, upon the ancient prophecies, He declared plainly enough what He meant by the bread, when He called the bread His own body. He likewise, when mentioning the cup, and making the (New) Testament to be sealed in His blood, affirms the reality of His body. For no blood can belong to a body which is not of flesh. Thus from the evidence of the flesh we get a proof of the body, and a proof of the flesh from the evidence of the blood." That these obscure passages should not be construed as excluding the Real Presence is to be concluded from the boldly realistic affirmations found elsewhere.

In his tract *De Idololatria*, written before the *Adversus Marcionem*, and while he was still a Catholic, he warns the Christians against the manufacturing of idols, as it would be sacrilegious to receive the body of Our Lord in hands[34] which had been employed in such a task.

"A whole day the zeal of faith will direct its pleadings to this quarter: bewailing that a Christian should come from idols into the

[32]Cf. Tixeront, *La théologie anténicéenne*, p. 349.

[33]*Adv. Marc.* iv, 40.

[34]It was the custom in the Early Church to receive the Eucharist in the hands at Communion.

Church . . . should raise to God the Father, hands which are the mothers of idols, should apply to the Lord's body those hands which confer bodies on demons. Nor is this sufficient. Grant that it be a small matter if from other hands they receive what they contaminate; but even these very hands deliver to others what they have contaminated. Idol-artificers are chosen even into the ecclesiastical order. Oh! wickedness! Once did the Jews lay hands on Christ; these mangle His body daily. Oh, hands to be cut off! Now let the saying, 'If thy hand make thee do evil amputate it' (Matt. xviii, 8) see to it whether it were uttered by way of similitude. What hands more to be amputated than those in which scandal is done to the Lord's body."[35]

Evidently his reasoning would have no force unless the faithful at Carthage believed in the Real Presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist. In his tract *De Oratione*, the first part of which is a fine commentary on the Lord's prayer, Tertullian applies the fourth petition to the Eucharist, and seems to allude to the Real Presence. "Christ is our bread. His body is reckoned (*censetur*) in bread: 'This is my body.' And so in petitioning for daily bread we ask to be always in Christ, and never to be separated from His body."[36] Tertullian's citation of the words used by Christ in the institution of the Eucharist seems sufficient to set aside the interpretation that he means by the word "body" to designate the mystical body of Christ, i. e., the Church.[37] Indeed the application of the Lord's prayer to the Eucharist became classical after Tertullian, as we shall see in the works of his disciple, St. Cyprian, and also in the later Fathers.

No less clear is the testimony of Tertullian in favor of the Real Presence after he had become a Montanist. In his *De Resurrectione Carnis* he argues that the flesh will be raised because it is the very condition on which salvation hinges; as it is through the flesh that the soul is sanctified, viz., in the rites of the Christian initiation

"Not a soul can at all procure salvation, except it believe whilst it is in the flesh, so true is it that the flesh is the very condition on which salvation hinges. And since the soul is, in consequence of its

[35] *De Idololat*, 7.

[36] *De Orat.* 6.

[37] "No argument, one way or another, can be found in this expression. *Censeri* has at least no necessary idea of symbolism attaching to it." Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 311. "Nous inclinons plutot à voir dans *censetur* le synonyme de *ostenditur*. . . . Toutefois la difficulté ne porte pas sur le sens de *censetur*; elle porte sur le point de savoir s'il s'agit de l'Eucharistie . . . s'il s'agit de l'Eglise. Je n'oserais pas me prononcer." Batiffol, l. c., p. 221.

salvation, chosen to the service of God, it is the flesh which actually renders it capable of such service. The flesh indeed is washed in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed (with the cross) that the soul may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed with the imposition of hands, that the soul may be illuminated by the spirit; the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul likewise may be fattened on (its) God. They cannot then be separated in their recompense, when they are united in their service."[38]

And this clearly realistic view "is not decisively contradicted by anything else in his writings."[39]

Saint Cyprian. The attention of St. Cyprian was taken up not so much with speculating on questions of belief as with the settlement of practical difficulties.

The first difficulty he had to contend with came from the apostasy of many Christians during the Decian persecution. The *lapsi* were anxious to receive the Eucharist even before having done penance. This aroused strong objections from St. Cyprian who emphasized the grievous sin of unworthy communion. In his work *De Lapsis*, after having recalled[40] the words of St. Paul on unworthy communion, he says[41] that in the case of the *lapsi* who communicate before having done penance, "violence is done to His (the Lord's) body and blood; and they sin now against their Lord." Later on,[42] he comments upon the story of the miracles wrought at Carthage to prevent the *lapsi* from receiving holy communion or to punish them for having done so.

In his treatise *De Oratione Dominica*, written in 252, a year after the *De Lapsis*, and under similar circumstances, he follows Tertullian

[38]Ch. 8.

[39]Gore, l. c., p. 311. But we are disappointed in reading on the following page: "It is perhaps safest to assume that Tertullian was uncertain in his own mind as to the exact nature which he attributed to the eucharistic gifts." Nor do we find more satisfactory the explanation advanced by Swete: "Tertullian seems to have been satisfied with a virtual identification of the Eucharist with the body and blood of Christ; in his judgment, if we understand him rightly, the Bread and Cup are figures, although not bare figures, since by Christ's ordinance they are authorized and effective representations of the realities which they symbolize . Such a view of the Eucharist well accords with the legal bent of the great African's mind. Frigid and jejune as it may seem, it does not appear to have interfered with his sense of the reality of the gift." (l. c., p. 173.) Batiffol says: "Le pain est une figure du corps; le corps est une realité mysterieuse." (l. c., p. 224).

[40]*De Lapsis*, 15.

[41]*Ibid.* 16.

[42]*Ibid.* 25, 26.

in his interpretation of the fourth petition: *Panem nostrum*, as referring to the Eucharist. "We call Christ our bread because He is ours as we come in contact with His body (*Christus eorum qui corpus ejus contingimus panis est.*) And we ask that this bread should be given to us daily, that we who are in Christ and daily receive the Eucharist for the food of salvation, may not by the interposition of some heinous sin, by being prevented as withheld and not communicating, from partaking of the heavenly bread, be separated from Christ's body, as He Himself predicts and warns: I am the bread of life, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of my flesh he shall live forever: and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world."[43]

The other difficulty of a practical order which St. Cyprian had to settle was this. Some African Bishops used water alone with bread in the morning celebration of the Eucharist, and in the evening, wine mixed with water, through fear lest the odor of wine taken in the morning hours might lead to their detection as Christians. St. Cyprian wrote to Cecilius[44] to condemn this abuse and to show him that wine is necessary to offer the Eucharist since our Lord Himself has so ordered. The letter emphatically affirms the Real Presence, and the sacrificial character of the Eucharist.

Like St. Paul and St. Ignatius, St. Cyprian considers the Eucharist as the symbol of the unity of the Church and he thus interprets it in his letters to Magnus[45] and to Cecilius.[46]

Thus it is manifest that in spite of some obscure texts of Tertullian, the Fathers of this second group whilst abstaining from any theory about the Eucharist, believe that the eucharistic body of Christ is truly his real body. Their reasoning against the Gnostics would have no demonstrative force if the eucharistic body of Christ were not his real historical body.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

---

[43] *De Orat. Dom.* 18.
[44] *Epist.* 63. Edit. Hartel.
[45] *Epist.* 69.
[46] *Epist*, 63, 13.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF EVIL

Reverend Thomas J. Gerrard, in THE NEW YORK REVIEW, for April-May, 1906, dealing with the so-called dilemma of Epicurus, restated the same in words from a newspaper, which he does not name. In the extract thus reproduced the questions are asked: How could a good God create mankind, knowing[1] that the vast majority were doomed to eternal torment; how could a just God punish for sin men born without their own choice and with an inherited sinful nature; how could He allow sin to be as eternal as good, and Satan to reign as long in hell as Christ in heaven?

Father Gerrard justly notes the falsity of the assumption that the "vast majority" of men according to Church teaching are eternally lost, or any "majority" at all. While common experience shows that every man is born with a sinful nature to the extent at least that he is subjected to strong and oft-recurring temptations, that same experience shows also that with this sinful nature he receives likewise a better one; which better nature, with God's grace and the man's own earnest efforts, will combat with and hold in subjection its evil companion. And if the bad that is in any man finally prevails, he alone and not God is responsible for the result. When the government securely bridges a dangerous river, it is not blamable for the folly of those who drown themselves in the waters.

It is equally unjust to charge God with the evil results which have come to the human race from its fall in Adam. The first sin was committed deliberately and after full instruction and solemn warning. Nevertheless, God in His infinite mercy has repaired for men of good will the injury of this fall by His atoning sacrifice upon Calvary. By His death He has opened again the gate of heaven for all who care to so order their lives and conduct in this world as to fit themselves for citizenship in the holy and eternal City of God.

Evil and misery are dealt with by the writer quoted by Father Gerrard as though they were things whose exact nature, with their interrelations, were fully and generally understood. Sin and evil are to be eternal, he considers, simply because their consequences to wicked and impenitent souls are to be without end. Satan is spoken of as though his abode in hell constitutes a reigning, actually such, or as similar or comparable in any way to the reign of Christ in Heaven.

The writer quoted by Rev. Father Gerrard has this to say, among other things: "Worst of all puzzles, perhaps, was that of the existence of evil and misery, and the racking doubt whether God could be good and look on the evil and misery of the world unmoved and untouched. It seemed so impossible to believe that a Creator could either be cruel enough to be indifferent to the misery, or weak enough to be unable to

---

[1]Foreknowledge has nothing to do with these questions. God makes every man free, placing his eternal destiny in his own hands. It could not be otherwise without loss of human liberty. Each human being may be likened to a ship which one man builds and another sails. The builder, even if he be a prophet, is not responsible for the final wreck which may be caused by the sailor's crime or stupidity.

stop it. The old dilemma faced me incessantly: If He can prevent it and does not, He is not good: if He wishes to prevent it and cannot, He is not Almighty. I racked my brain for an answer. I searched the writings of believers for a clue, but found no way of escape."

The writer of the above seems dazed in presence of this mystery or series of mysteries. None the less he seemed able to fathom the feelings of God, and to know that He looks "on the misery of this world unmoved and untouched;" and he seems very certain that, to the Infinite Intelligence of the Almighty, no course is conceivable or open other than "to be indifferent to the misery of the world, or else to stop it."

Rev. Father Gerrard finds fault with the efforts some make to answer by reason these suggested difficulties. His position seems to be that we must concede the conditions to be practically as stated against us, and accept it all as a mystery absolutely impenetrable. Faith is to be here our only recourse and refuge. "Since we must always fall back on mystery," says Father Gerrard, "I suggest that the mystery must be sought in another place. Let us admit at once that so far as our limited power of reasoning goes, God does appear at times cruel and unjust."

Thoughtful Christians, generally, will not make any such admission; and with due respect to the views of Rev. Father Gerrard, so ably defended, they are under no compulsion to yield the point.

The Century Dictionary thus defines the word cruel: "Disposed to inflict suffering physical or mental, indifferent to or taking pleasure in the pain or distress of any sentient being; willing or pleased to torment, vex or afflict; destitute of pity, compassion or kindness; hard hearted, pitiless." To constitute a cruelty, therefore, the pain or distress must be inflicted without good motive and from the mere satisfaction which the wicked find in visiting them upon others. The parent applying the rod, the surgeon with his knife are true ministers of mercy. Even the executioner with his rope is not cruel, since he puts to death for the protection of society.

Though the words misery and evil are often used in closest association, they are not synonymous. However difficult it may be to fix upon the ultimate meaning of the term evil, it is easy for present purposes to define misery. The word is here used in its subjective sense and as suggesting a mental state or condition; the result of prolonged pain or discomfort of any sort. It can have, in this sense, no application to the state of the Christian Martyrs who exulted in the sufferings they endured for Christ, and looked forward to a speedy entrance into Paradise. Nor can it serve to describe the condition of the extremely poor who take their troubles lightly.[2] On the other hand, the word has application to the life and feelings of many who, surrounded by all that this world can give, are nevertheless grievously dissatisfied with their lot. Misery being, as has been shown, a subjective condition, the Lord is not responsible for its abiding in certain minds and hearts; for He calls every man to a state of thought and feeling which if sought for and cultivated must raise his soul out of and above misery.

We find greater difficulty when we seek a definite meaning for the word evil. Suggestions already made while dealing with the state or

[2] "In Naples, misery laughs and sings and plays the Pandean pipes and enjoys itself." T. B. Aldrich, *Ponkapog and Pesth*, p. 138.

feeling of misery may serve us also to prove that physical or mental pains do not in themselves constitute evils: for pain of every character may be and often is triumphed over and made to become a source of satisfaction and indeed of actual joy. Furthermore, pain and suffering are often the price paid for some great good: as were the passion and death of the Redeemer. The carrying of the cross with Christ leads to final resurrection also with Him. The daily toil of the husband and father puts bread into the mouths of the wife and child.

All of this is just and right, for to a great extent the value of things lies in their cost. Were diamonds plentiful as the pebbles, children would play with them upon the streets. Human liberty is precious, because its price is blood and suffering. Were infants born and reared without suffering and much patience children might come eventually to occupy no dearer place in the family than do now the dogs and horses.

Indeed under existing conditions, pain and hardship seem necessary for maintaining the excellence of the human race. The toil and trials of the individual give him fortitude and strength which are transmitted to his offspring. Were all men confirmed Sybarites mankind would doubtless perish entirely. Nor is it alone the rugged human virtues that suffering fosters; it cultivates also the gentler ones of love and charity. The Savior has said: "The poor you shall have always with you,"[3] and it must be the same with "the feeble, the blind and the lame."[4] At first these words of the Redeemer seem expressive of a great and lasting evil; but in truth they announce one of humanity's blessings. The calls so often made upon us in sweet charity's behalf, the kind responses so frequently given and in such diverse ways—all of this goes to soften human hearts and to strengthen and draw closer the bonds of fraternal love. Were our feelings never touched in this way, were there no demands ever made for the exercise of mercy and goodness among men, our hearts would eventually become as dry and hard as rocks.

Furthermore, human suffering is a strong bond which unites every man of good will to God. It is a great instructor, continually teaching us our own weakness and ever proclaiming to us our absolute dependence upon the Lord. Affliction has turned many a heart to God, its Maker, which in its hour of comfort and ease had been far from Him; and but for the temptations and trials that are reminding us constantly of our Divine Protector, the best among us would be likely to drift away from Him completely. And even if without such constant reminding men might continue to think somewhat of God, surely there would be nowhere upon earth any high degree of sanctity; for it is only along the way of the cross that we may hope to draw, day by day, closer to God.

As things are constituted, what men regard commonly as the evils of life are the true foils of all its joys; for experience of discomfort and pain make us conscious or, rather, appreciative of happiness when it comes. Remembering the bitterness and gloom of Winter, we enjoy the more by contrast the balminess of Spring. The Prodigal Son, having lived with swine and fed with them upon husks, appreciated, as he had not done before, the delights of his father's house.

---

[3]Mark xiv, 7; John xii, 8.
[4]Luke xiv, 21.

Since the fall of the entire human race, in and through Adam, each individual man, with the assistance of course of God's grace, must save his own soul. He must of his own free will choose heaven and as it were conquer it. But how shall heaven be chosen, or rather the good that leads to it, if there be no opposite attraction to which it is to be preferred? How can there be a conquest without an enemy to be conquered? By freely choosing the good and combatting evil, man in a way merits heaven. Therefore without evil there could be no human merit and if under such conditions men were found in heaven, they would be there involuntarily, placed within it as so much merchandise which has been trucked into a warehouse.[5]

The mere non-doing of wrong is not virtue. Abstinence from evil is moral goodness only when such abstinence is in opposition to temptation. The baby at the breast, the unconscious man or woman are not to be considered virtuous simply because they are working no harm of any sort. The memory of the chaste Susanna is cherished not so much because she was pure as for the reason that she maintained her purity despite the most cruel threats, and in face of what seemed certain death. It was the wickedness of the two elders which furnished her with the occasion for so bravely manifesting her allegiance to God by adhering to the good under most difficult circumstances and rejecting evil.

So far as earthly pains and sufferings are concerned, they are mere results flowing from antecedent causes of various sorts. The ache of the wound is chargeable to the hand that struck the blow; the penury of one age follows the extravagance of its predecessor or predecessors; loss of life from volcanic eruptions occur because people will build their homes adjacent to treacherous craters. And among all the affiictions of human life, what one is there which can be fairly charged to the Almighty? Does God excite the fury that leads to desolating wars, or fill the hearts of criminals with the malice which draws them to the perpetration of so much wickedness? Does He inspire the extravagance and dissipation which wreck fortunes and lives and is followed by such distressing consequences to succeeding generations?

And when we consider these many and sad results of human folly and crime, should we not strive to penetrate beneath the surface, and ascertain whether, despite their varied shapes and seeming variety of origins, they are not, after all, closely related, and all springing from some one common and remoter cause. By doing this we may perchance be enabled to find some sufficient answer to the question: What is evil? Then we may be able, possibly, to go further and determine satisfactorily to ourselves where rests the responsibility for the presence of evil in this world.

---

[5]This reasoning does not apply to born idiots, or to infants dying before attaining reason. These are exceptions—creatures who, through no fault of their own are deprived of the opportunity of personally choosing the good. Because of their deprivation, they are saved solely by the merits of Christ applied to them through baptism. But, though thus merciful to them, the Lord is not responsible for conditions in these exceptional cases. The incapacity of the idiot and the premature death of the infant are results flowing from natural cuses, or perhaps from the unwise or even vicious conduct of parents and others.

Is there anything in the nature of suffering among men that is not traceable to some human act, or else due to some perversion of the forces and conditions of nature, established by God for useful purposes? Death, it is true, visits all; but coming as it should, in natural course and as the close to long and useful lives, it is no curse but a blessing. Were all the laws ordained by the Almighty faithfully observed, and had it so been from the beginning; had all men been from the time of Adam, wise, good, and charitable, there would be few permature or sudden deaths among us, and none unprovided. For those who love and serve God death has no terrors for he comes to such as an Angel of Resurrection. It is the same with bodily pain and mental distress. These also, at least as a rule, are brought to us by human agency. They are not ordained by God except perhaps in special cases and for some particular good. They are permitted by the Lord, or rather tolerated by Him, and this solely that evil, if any there be in them, may be overruled eventually, and forced in some way to advance the good.[6]

But it is contended that God created men capable of suffering and is therefore responsible for the effects which pain and evil generally produce upon them. This proposition is false. No finite sensitive creature can of its own nature be absolutely proof against suffering. God is the one only Omnipotent and infinitely Perfect Being, and the only One, therefore, who is of His own nature above the possible reach of pain in any shape. God as the Supreme Master of all, is able by His Omnipotence to safeguard surely every one of His myriads of creatures and thus supplement, as it were, for this purpose their imperfection and weakness; but outside of God, finite beings can find no certain protection against other creatures, against the forces of nature, and against themselves. Lucifer and his companions, demons now in hell, were originally bright Angels in heaven; Adam and Eve spent their first days in a garden of delights. In both cases, deprivation and pain followed a fall. The original happiness of these created beings depended upon their union with God, who made them, and who, had they proven loyal, could and would have shielded them from harm effectively and forever. The evil which overtook and crushed proud Lucifer, and that also which later overwhelmed Adam, proceeded primarily and casually from the wilful separation of these creatures from their God, from their voluntary rejection, so far as that was possible to them, of the Lord's dominion over themselves and the consequent forfeiture of all right to His providential care and protection. In each case, this was sin, which is the deliberate and most ungrateful rebellion of a creature, intelligent and free but still dependent, against his Creator and Sovereign Benefactor. And since the Providence of the Almighty is the one and only effective safeguard to finite beings against injury of every character, it follows that sin is the first and true cause of

[6] Creation has its own great purpose: the final triumph of God, and the manifestation of His infinite Power and Goodness, His complete Justice and boundless Mercy. This glorious plan and the measures which are surely bringing about its full accomplishment, must be studied all together, if at all. There is, from this standpoint, but little advantage to be derived from pondering over particular ones out of the myriads of details—just as historians do not concern themselves with the experiences of particular combatants in the ranks, but rather with the results of great battles and entire campaigns.

all actual evil, since it has taken us from under the impenetrable shield of divine protection, and left us exposed to things that harm us. It is the primary and fundamental evil, and all else in the way of misfortune and suffering is secondary and derivative. It is the root and trunk of the noxious tree; and all the other ills of soul and body which we have to endure are mere branches and leaves.

These secondary and derivative evils are conquerable, if disassociated from the master evil, sin. The virtuous man, by mere right living, escapes many of them and the worst; and for the rest, his Christian philosophy is a remedy, since it shows their transiency and discloses their true mission for the just, which is to further purify and uplift the soul and to increase its reward. Viewing, therefore, the entire matter from this higher standpoint, we may justly maintain that the only evil, actually such, in the world is sin; and further we may conclude that had there never been a sin committed on earth, never a single departure, during all human history, from the rule of right, conditions here would be perfect and men would not be sufferers.

It follows logically from what has been said, that to accuse God of being the Author of evil, really such, is to charge Him with having introduced sin into the world, which is a contention contrary to Christian teaching and also to natural reason. The Church tells us that God is infinitely perfect, infinitely holy, infinitely just. Anything, therefore, that is unjust or unholy as is sin, must be repugnant to the divine nature, and cannot have originated with God. Moreover God's will is supreme and dominant, and His solely is the privilege to direct and govern all. That only is right, therefore, which He establishes and ordains, that only wrong which He forbids. Consequently it is of the essence of sin, that the will of God be contravened, and if He be willing there can be no sin. To pretend that He is responsible for opposition to His own will, and for the results, necessarily baneful, that flow from such opposition, is illogical.

But, it is urged, God could have prevented sin, with all of its disastrous consequences, and for this reason, it is claimed, He is blamable for all. Sin being rebellion against the Almighty, how could He have prevented its appearance in the world, except by abstaining from the creation of man, or else by withholding from him the gift of free will?

Considering the great reward which comes to the just in Heaven is it a reasonable proposition to suggest that the countless souls that, while on earth chose God and are now in eternal bliss, should never have been created; and this simply because certain other souls have scorned to avail themselves of similar happy chances and have preferred to obstinately travel the path to perdition? What would be said of the man who would preach the abolition of all wealth, for the reason that there are some who are too indolent or too wicked to labor for its honest acquirement?

Like reasons suggest themselves in opposition to the possible contention that God might have excluded sin from the world by denying free will to man. The gift just mentioned constitutes one of the highest human endowments. Without it we could not be like unto God. All human merit arises from its possession, and it is one of the sources of human dignity and greatness. Exclude the thought of it from our conceptions of human experience, and we must surrender at once the idea of heaven, or else make of this life an absolute enigma. If every one of

us be from the beginning billed, as it were, for Paradise, as cattle are for their market, and without will or wish on our part, of what avail the delay of this life and its numerous and manifest trials? What husbandman is there, who having resolved to place his animals in the pasture, would deem it a proper preliminary to drive them all around and about the farm?

If free will be a gift so precious to men, should the fact that some may put to evil use serve as a sufficient reason that it should be withheld entirely from mankind, and that the wise as well as the wicked should be deprived of it? There is not a blessing or an endowment that humanity enjoys which is not similarly perverted by vicious men, and made to serve evil ends.

Finally, on this branch of our subject, it may be claimed that God might have so enlightened every human understanding and so inflamed with charity every human heart that practically sin would have been an impossibility in this world. To this the answer suggests itself that, whatever the merciful Lord may do in the way of special election, in particular cases such a course pursued universally, would, in effect, change the general plan of salvation with human co-operation; for it would obscure God's justice in His dealings with men, and disclose His mercy only, and would detract from the merit of multitudes who have borne away the kingdom of heaven by violence.

God gives grace to all; and to no man less than sufficient for salvation, if responded to. But just as He makes no blade of grass the exact counterpart of its fellows, so the Almighty, with men, does not measure out His grace alike. Infinite variation is one of the characteristics of creation, and is serves as one of the proofs or marks of the infinite Intelligence of God and of His Omnipotence. The same it must be in Heaven. It may be taken as certain that no two Angels are precisely alike, and no two souls. If Angels differ from Archangels, Cherubim from Seraphim, and so on, it is because of the differences in the glories with which the Lord has clothed them.

The final individual character of each soul must be shaped in a large measure by its own spiritual experiences upon earth; and in the celestial kingdom, every saint will doubtless show forth plainly what God has done for him and what in turn he has done for himself while in this world. The Martyrs will shine with a glory of their class, and the same with the Virgins and Confessors. The history of God's dealings with each soul will be probably as though written in letters of gold upon its brow. One of the splendors of heaven must lie in the almost infinite variation in the particular glories of its innumerable inhabitants. The magnificence in a great garden is to be found chiefly in the multitude and varied beauty of its plants; and the excellence of the harp in the number of strings and in the great variety of its tones. Indeed, variations in God's spiritual gifts may be considered as a necessity for the establishment of individuality. Were there no noticeable differences in the shapes and characters of men on this earth, they could not be distinguished from one another. We may conclude that it would be the same in Heaven were all souls alike in the degree and kind of glory which they disclose, in the visible impresses which the grace of God with their own correspondence thereto, has left upon them.

Since every soul receives grace sufficient, if availed of, for working out its salvation, and will receive more on sincerely soliciting it, no one,

whether he has done well or badly with what has been given to him, may justly complain against the Lord because of His superior generoisty to others. The poor and the rich live side by side on this earth. The former are given physical strength, and skill and intelligence sufficient for work; and faithful labor will bring to them the necessities of life and many of its pleasures. Have the manual toilers of the world the right, because others near them are wealthy, to refuse taking life as it has come to themselves, and to abstain from laboring for the needs of themselves and their families?

We cannot here enter into any special defence of the Christian belief in the existence and the eternity of hell, as this is a deep subject, calling for careful and elaborate consideration of its own; and the purpose of this paper is to deal with the problem of evil in its more general aspects, and to show that the only actual and absolute evil is sin, and that our merciful Creator is not chargeable with cruelty because of sin's presence in this world, and that He is not responsible for its consequences. We may, however, remark before closing that the direct punishment of the damned is their final exclusion from the presence of God, who is the ultimate source of all beauty and joy, and away from whose countenance all must be darkness and despair; and that God has the right to fix the time for each individual man within which He is to be gained and also to impose the conditions; and that if the Divine Will in these regards be obstinately resisted by any man until his allotment of time upon earth is exhausted, such an obdurate one is entitled to no additional trial in eternity. We may also add the suggestion that, even were lost souls given a respite beyond the grave they might avail themselves of the indulgence, not for the purpose of repentance and reform, but simply to multiply the number of their transgressions.

FRANK MCGLOIN.

Author of *The Light of Faith.*

It was the advice of Cardinal Newman, I think: "Never review your reviewer." The principle involved is, I take it, that the writer when he undertakes to write an article or book undertakes to say the best that he has to say; that the reviewer undertakes to point out the chief merits and demerits of the work; and that the reading public should be left to judge between the two. The fitness of that advice is well illustrated by the article which I wrote on the philosophy of evil and the review with which I have been honored by the Hon. Frank McGloin. My article was occasioned by the remark of a friend who once said: "Why do you keep making these frantic attempts to answer a difficulty which is unanswerable? John Stuart Mill has stated the indictment once and for always. Meet his eloquent charge and then you will have something worth listening to." I could not pretend to the eloquence of Mill, but I did feel that even granting the case against us were quite as strong as he made out, still the Catholic Faith had an answer. In looking over the criticism by the Hon. Frank McGloin, I can honestly say that there is nothing there that I have not seen before. Indeed nearly everything which he says is found in other words in the two writers whom I discussed. Consequently I have nothing substantially new to add to what I have

said. With the permission of the Editor, however, I would like to add a few items of information on the bibliography of the subject which have come to my knowledge in the meantime.

The manuscript of the late Bishop Bellord on "The Number of the Saved" will probably be in the hands of the public before these notes are published. It is contained in a book entitled: *Folia Fugitiva*, published by Washbourne in England and Benziger in America (5 s.). The articles by Father Sydney Smith, S. J., are reprinted in book form by the Catholic Truth Society, London, (6 d.) In Father Tyrrell's recent book *Lex Credendi*, the problem is stated with a boldness and eloquence exceeding that of John Stuart Mill or of any other writer. And even to Father Tyrrell, with all his vast knowledge of modern apologetic and with all his keen insight into the intricacies of questions of the hour, the only satisfying answer is faith in Our Father who is in heaven.

"The conception," he says, "of God as a father is easy for religion in its childish stages, when reverence and love are but crude and embryonic. But when science has pulverized the earth and made it a speck in a measureless waste of suns; when it has shown us the reign of ruthless law in little and great, outside us and within us; and when reflection has penetrated us with the sense of God's otherness and unlikeness and brought it home to our feeling and imagination—then, indeed, it is only the very heroism of faith that can affirm a likeness and sameness notwithstanding and can say, "Our Father who art in heaven." Yet without such faith, our mental and moral life must be brought to a standstill through a paralyzing sceptism. If God's otherness were such that what is false for us might be true for Him, or what is evil in us might be good in Him; if, as rash preachers have sometimes implied, He has a right to deceive or to be cruel; if differences of false and true, good and evil, depend merely on His arbitrary *fiat*—then our standards of moral and mental endeavor are purely relative. We might fear such a Being as we fear an earthquake, or a volcano, or the unknown and capricious forces of nature; but reverence Him we could not. . . .

"But it is only by faith of the highest kind that this Fatherhood can be held firmly, so as to be the governing inspiration of our lives. The evidence of all-controlling goodness and love in the world round us grows weaker and not stronger in the cold light of purely intellectual criticism; for such criticism excludes the reasons of the heart. It sees only a vast mechanism, callously grinding out good and evil, joy and sorrow on no conceivable plan, now rewarding virtue, now punishing it, with a capriciousness that excludes all idea of intelligent goodness. We could not possibly love, praise, or reverence a man who acted as nature, or God through nature, often seems to act. We should feel ourselves immeasurably better than such a one, for all our selfishness and frailty—that is to say, if we were to attend to what *seems* to be; to the imperfect revelation of God given in the world, apart from the things made known in the heart. Could the worst of us stand by and witness the agonies of any innocent, reasonless creature, child or animal, if our bare *fiat* could relieve those agonies? One such instance would be an unanswerable difficulty against millions of contrary instances. Yet there are oceans of such seemingly gratuitous and useless agony all round us at every moment. We cannot then under pain of moral scepticism, say that the world, as it seems in the

light of purely intellectual criticism, appears to be the work of One who is at once all-good and all-mighty."[1]

Let every reader, however, get this book for himself and read these passages in their context.

In conclusion I would add, if I may be allowed a slight digression, that I have received privately a difficulty from an agnostic friend which really touches the very root of the question at issue. He writes: "Your arguments and quotations are admirable up to nearly the end, when to my disappointment you thus conclude: 'But he alone has succeeded who by exerting his noblest endowment of free will has reached out beyond reason and by faith has grasped God.' What do you mean by the last three words, *has grasped God*? Or rather by the last three letters, *G. O. D*?" My friend knows the arguments for the existence of God quite as well as I do. What he actually wants in the Beatific Vision, whereas I can only give him analogies. It is only in the face-to-face presence that all the particular reasons of things will be seen. Meanwhile we have to be content with the dark glass of shadows and images, the "will to believe" being the faculty by which we cling on until the day break and the shadows flee away.

THOMAS J. GERRARD.

New Hall, Chelmsford, England.

[1] *Lex Credendi*, by George Tyrrell (Longmans) pp. 125-127.

NOTES.

Various items of news which we find scattered here and there in Continental periodicals indicate clearly that the storm-center of the Catholic intellectual movement is shifting rapidly from France to Italy. Important movements of thought, it is true, are largely independent of national limitations, especially in this age of rapid dissemination of facts and opinions. But the field of knowledge is a vast one, and local reasons are powerful in determining the special portion of it to which any body of scholars will first turn their attention. And so we find that interest in the new lines of study has not manifested itself simultaneously among theologians or rulers in the various sections of the Church.

It might have been expected that the German Catholics would bear the heaviest portion of the burden which modern research and criticism placed upon the medieval theology. In the new ventures in the fields of metaphysics and cosmology, of archeology and criticism, many of the leaders, and not a few of the pioneers, were of the race of Hegel and Strauss. The universities of Germany became the centers of the new sciences. Its flexible though awkward language was twisted into strange compounds to make it a vehicle for their presentation. And so it came to pass that in Germany, to receive a liberal education meant to be put into touch with a number of facts and theories which seemed to tell—or were made to seem to tell—against traditional Christian ideas. In response to the evident needs of the situation there arose a number of scholars and apologists who showed that German Catholics were not behind their fellow-countrymen in the possession of those powers of mind which had put the Fatherland at the head of the intellectual movement. We need only mention the names of Schanz, the two Fathers Pesch, Schell, Bickell, von Hummelauer, Funk, Bardenhewer. In the field of history proper, we might add Pastor, Janssen, Grisar, Denifle, etc., but these, though modern in their methods, do not in the main handle the new questions. In spite of names such as these, however, it must be admitted that Germany cannot claim to have held first place in the new movement in Catholic scholarship. Conditions have been such that the main force of Catholic zeal and intelligence has been directed into other channels, first to the redress of political grievances, and latterly to the settlement of social and economic problems. A vast measure of success has been attained on these lines, but at the expense of the intellectual supremacy in the Church which, seemingly at least, the Germans might have held.

In England, there was no persecution to disturb the peace and leisure of the student and call him to the newspaper office or the hustings. There was learning and genius a-plenty; but here again circumstances determined the line of their activity. The more urgent questions were those which divided the Christian fold, and the attacks of those who ranged themselves without were in the main left unanswered. Much of the work done in history and patrology will last. And it must not be

forgotten that in the present crisis the most modern of our apologists select their weapons from the armory supplied by the great English Cardinal who concerned himself little with Kant or Spencer or Darwin, and who touched but slightly, and only in later life, on what is called the biblical question. In our own time, however, there has been a remarkable rise of interest in the modern problems and points of view; one need only mention the names of Barry, Ward, Maher, Tyrrell, Thurston, Lucas, Kent, Chapman, McNabb.

In Ireland, as in Germany, the injustice of the governing body turned the attention of the clergy to political and economic questions; and it is only very recently that the improvement in domestic affairs has set them free to enter into the wider arena of problems affecting the general interests of the Church and of humanity. Political questions have been urgent in the Netherlands also, but Louvain has done noble work in fostering Catholic scholarship, as is shown by the achievements of men like Mercier, de Harlez, Van Hoonacker, Poels, Coppieters. In America urgent and practical problems in connection with the organizing of the Church, have absorbed the energies of the ablest men, but the leaven of the youthful Catholic University is making itself felt.

Theological interests in the Peninsular have been confined to fighting over again the quarrels of the Schools and of the Orders within the Church—to the mind of the man in the forefront of the present conflict, "old, unhappy far-off things, and battles long ago." Some of their reviews show that there is a growing interest in matters which are of concern beyond the Pyrenees, but the attitude of the writers is that of a controversialist, say in France, of thirty years ago. It may be none the less true for that, but evidently, for the present at least, there is but little hope from Spain or Portugal of anything especially original or illuminating.

M. l'Abbé Houtin, in his clever though rather malicious book *La Question Biblique chez les Catholiques de France dans le XIXième siècle*, draws a vivid picture of the unpreparedness of French Catholic scholarship to meet the inroads of the new German learning which was made almost popular in France by the literary genius of Renan. Men of the erudite stamp of Le Hir, Lenormant, and de Broglie were rare. But a challenge had been given, and a gauntlet is speedily picked up when flung down before men with the spirit of the Franks. A large number of the students who were not too old to try the hazard of a new enterprise turned eagerly yet calmly to study the tactics of the enemy. The results are seen to-day in the vast output of works of apologetics and of erudition which, in spite of the gravest difficulties, is being produced by the Catholics of France.

It was natural to expect that the countrymen of Pascal, Chateaubriand, and Gratry would enlist in the service of religion the methods of philosophy and the graces of literary form; and along these lines French genius has produced a host of apologists: Denis, Fonsegrive, Blondel, Brunetière, Laberthonnière, to mention only a few. But one would not have been so ready to prophesy that the work of the Latins would be marked by the qualities of thoroughness and accuracy, which in some quarters are supposed to be almost a monopoly of their neighbors across the Rhine.

And yet it is precisely on these lines that the Gallic genius has achieved its greatest successes. The only word which can express the extent of the erudition of the Catholic scholars of France is Dominie Sampson's "Prodigious!" The names of a number of them are familiar: Lagrange, Scheil, Martin, Le Camus, Rose, Condamin, Loisy, Vigouroux, Batiffol, Turmel, Tixeront, Jacquier, Duchesne; and among the younger clergy there is a whole host of scholars of lesser note but of equal ability. Indeed, some observers are of opinion that, as things are going, certain branches of intellectual inquiry, especially Oriental languages and archaeology, will in time be almost entirely in the hands of the priests in France.

The movement in Italy is more recent and less widespread. At present, at least in the main, it seems to be less a movement towards theological readjustment than a widening of mental horizons by including within the scope of clerical studies fields which were as Central Africa to the priests of twenty years ago. This advance is evident not only in reviews like the *Studi Religiosi* and the *Rivista Storica-Critica* but also in those of the scholarly-conservative type, like the *Civilta Cattolica*. Tendencies towards new theories are, however, not wanting; and at times one finds, very naturally, an insistence on the liberty of the Catholic scholar in points which the Church itself has not defined. But one does not detect, at least in those engaged on the intellectual side of the forward movement, any note of insubordination to the Church or any lack of confidence in the happy solution of the difficulties.

Passing over the Roman archaeologists—a very eminent body of scholars,—and leaving out of account foreign savants residing in Italy, such as Duchesne, Vigouroux, Janssens, Delattre, we find a number of scholars who are doing very serious work along the lines of the "new" learning,—which, indeed, at least so far as methods go, cannot be considered so very "new" in the land of Mai and de Rossi. Some of the more representative scholars are: Genocchi, Procurator General of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, who has given a stimulus to Oriental studies in the Holy City; his confrere Bonaccorsi; Minocchi, editor of *Studi Religiosi*; Brandi, of the *Civilta*; Buonaiuti, of the *Rivista Storico-Critica*; Amelli, Prior of Monte Cassino; Guidi, Guignoni, Benigni, Mercati, Turchi, Federici, Palmieri Fracassini; nor should we omit the names of three men, now no more: Canon di Bartolo and the Jesuit Orientalists di Cara and Brunengo. As may be expected, these scholars are far from being of one school of thought, but all have been instrumental in bringing the new problems to the fore among the Catholics of Italy. There is also, as in France, a class of apologists who devote themselves to what may be called in a broad sense, the philosophy of religion. The famous Barnabite writer and preacher, Padre Semeria, though no mean scholar, might justly be put in this category. Here too as in France (and indeed in England, as witness the two Wards, father and son, Mivart, Lilly, Devas, etc.), laymen are prominent. Among these the most widely known is Senator Antonio Fogazzaro.

The whole situation cannot be properly viewed without bearing in mind that it is complicated by the introduction of new political and social ideals. Thus there is the school which believes in a readjustment of the

relations of Church and State, especially in Italy. These views are more prevalent among the laity than among the clergy, but they have found a bold spokesman in the hierarchy in the person of Mgr. Bonomelli, Bishop of Cremona. Social discontent, which is not without its justification in Italy, has turned the attention of the Italian clergy, especially of the North, to social and economic problems. A part of their energies has been devoted, under the patronage of Cardinals Svampa and Ferrari, to practical schemes for the improvement of the condition of the artisan and the peasant. But along with this there is running a movement of ideas which meets with deep disapprobation from the more conservative elements in Italian thought. The Holy See has endeavored to hold the Christian Democracy movement, as it is called, within the control of the Bishops, but the more energetic workers show strong tendencies towards independent action.

Naturally enough, these new developments are disquieting to some of those who hold authority in the Church, all the more since they have begun to display themselves at their very doors. We have said that the storm-center is shifting from France to Italy. This does not mean that Italian Catholics are taking the leadership in a movement of departure from traditional views. Far from it. Ideas which are put forward tentatively by Italian writers to-day have been discussed with unreproved freedom in French periodicals for at least a decade. But when Italian, and especially Roman theologians, pay favorable consideration to new developments, it gives them an importance in the eyes of the authorities which they did not possess when discussed in the remoter regions of Christendom. For instance, we are not unfamiliar with the case of works which ranged securely in various tongues on this side of the Alps, but which were suppressed when translated into Italian.

Of course there is an obvious explanation for this fact in the greater ease with which the Roman theologians can become acquainted with new drifts of thought when expressed in their native tongue. But in this as in so many other instances, the more obvious view is a very narrow view. The function of Rome, as Mr. Wilfrid Ward, following Newman, never wearies in pointing out, is essentially a conservative one. She is the depositary of tradition, and the final court of adjudication; and she must, if she be true to her function, merit the reproach (or the commendation) of being old-fashioned and of being slow. True, if theology is to be a living and a progressive science, if it is not to dwindle down to a mere *Catechismus pro Rudibus Instruendis*, the work of investigation and speculation must go on. But for new ideas the attitude of Rome must be mainly one of tolerance. That there should be a decrease of tolerance and an increase of vigilance according as new ideas are set forth in closer proximity to the inviolate See, is natural and proper—natural, because, to use the striking analogy of a Roman theologian, Rome is at the center of the religious circle, and near the center motion is slower than at points near the circumference; proper, since the fact that they are taught under the eyes of the Pope would give a false value to views which in the sifting of time might turn out to be illusionary and ephemeral. "Contemporary thought" makes it its proudest boast that it is up-to-date; the final decisions of Rome are nothing if they are not eternal.

It is possible, of course, that in the discharge of this function of conservatism, the subsidiary Roman tribunals may condemn movements of thought which afterwards justify themselves before the Church and the world. Such events however are not unmixed misfortunes, since they tend to restrain the ardor of the "unco guid," who demand that all such utterances should receive not only the obedience of the subject but the assent of the believer. W. G. Ward said he would like to have a new Papal Bull along with his *Times* every morning. It is scarcely possible he was altogether in earnest. At least it is pretty certain that a man of his ability would have repented his wish as soon as he saw all active personal interest in theological questions fade into the memorising of formulas. And, as a matter of history, the Holy Spirit works in the Church along lines more in accordance with our nature. The Pope is infallible, but papal definitions are few. And as in the case of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, though the Pope is the defining power, the doctrine emerges from the consciousness of the Church. Rome is generally content to apply the brakes whenever she finds the movement of thought too rapid for the good of the faithful or the consistent and orderly development of doctrine or discipline. This she does by means of non-infallible utterances,—through papal allocutions and encyclicals, decisions of permanent bureaus, such as the Sacred Congregations of the Inquisition and the Index, or of special bodies like the Biblical Commission.

By such means the Church secures from her loyal sons the at least temporary suppression of books or opinions that for the present are deemed untimely and dangerous. The evident advantage of these methods is that they satisfy the passing needs of the situation without binding the consciences of Catholics in perpetuity. When conditions and states of mind change, Rome offers no objection to theories which its officials once condemned. No Pope or congregation to-day would condemn a man for holding the heliocentric theory or for taking interest for money. The main defect of the system is that in some instances the faithful are left in doubt as to whether or not a decision is intended to be accepted as part of the "Depositum Fidei," and as such, binding on all consciences forever. We have, it is true, the assurance that the decisions of certain tribunals are not infallible and irrevocable; an assurance which is based no less on experience of their mistakes in the past than on theological reasoning. But at times, as in the case of the *Syllabus* of Pius IX, the force of the document is left in doubt, to become a source of embarrassment to apologists and strife among theologians and worry to the faithful. Men of a practical turn of mind find a way out of the difficulty by having recourse to the well established principle of Probabilism that an uncertain law does not bind. And certainly when they go further and compare the language of papal documents since 1854 with that of the final paragraph of the Bull *Ineffabilis* on the Immaculate Conception, it is hard to avoid their conclusion that when an authority which knows how to state a dogmatic definition so unmistakably, leaves another question in doubt, it is doing so with the intention of not binding absolutely the consciences of the faithful.

This little side excursion from the realm of fact to that of theological theory may not seem so much of a digression when we say that we may

record as at least a possible fact the advent of a new *Syllabus Errorum* to appear in the near future. As projected, we are informed, it is not to be a Syllabus like that of Pius IX—a synopsis of errors already condemned in numerous Encyclicals. The documents issued during the present pontificate refer rather to practical matters of Church discipline than to doctrinal questions. The plan proposed by the advocates of this new step is to issue a new series of condemned propositions with the reasons for their condemnation. However, in spite of strongly organized efforts which are being made by powerful forces to put the matter through, the plans may not be carried out. It is no secret that the Curia is far from unanimous on the subject, and that some of the Cardinals are opposing it strenuously as unwise and uncalled for.

Up to the present, so far as Italy is concerned, no breath of condemnation has reached anyone on account of work that may be called "scientific." It seems to be the plan of the authorities to leave the scholars undisturbed at their necessary tasks, and to keep a restraining hand on more popular religious movements which threaten to run beyond bounds. Thus the Pope's letter on the study of Scripture in the seminaries aims at strengthening the course so that students will be not only well informed on Bible questions, but also be equipped by knowledge of Oriental tongues for deeper studies in the future. Changes reported in the Scripture Faculties in the Roman universities indicate the same purpose of strengthening the teaching. Two years ago, it will be remembered, Père Delattre, S. J., left the University of Louvain, and went to Rome, to take the chair vacated by Father Gismondi, S. J., at the Gregorian University. Père Delattre gives place in turn to Père Mechineau, late professor in the Jesuit scholasticate at Chieri, in Piedmont. Père Mechineau, like his predecessor, is a distinguished Assyriologist. His work on the cuneiform inscriptions, done in conjunction with his confrere, Père Amiaud, is well known to Orientalists. He is an old fellow-student of Abbé Loisy at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, but his position on biblical questions is not the same as that of his compatriot. There is also a rumor, not confirmed at time of writing, that Father Hetzenhauer has resigned his chair of Scripture at the Apollinare. Father Hetzenhauer is an Austrian Capuchin, who two years ago, was called to the Apollinare to fill a place to which, it was generally believed, the late Sovereign Pontiff had destined Dr. Fracassini, the eminent Scripture scholar of Perugia. Father Hetzenhauer's teaching was severely criticised or rather ridiculed, in Houtin's latest book, and this fact is connected with the report of his resignation.

Turning now to the Holy Father's late Letter to the Italian Bishops, we find that his chief, though not his sole preoccupation with regard to the younger clergy is a fear that they may become taken up with ill-regulated movements for social reform. The clergy have obeyed the order to sever their connection with the autonomous societies. At the recent congress of the National Democratic League at Milan, no priest was present. Some of the lay members of the organization are still carrying it on. In Rome many of the members of the circle of Catholic university students which was dissolved by the Cardinal Vicar have organized a new society under the title—the Galileo Galilei Union.

The Abbate Murri, who was the most prominent clerical leader in the Christian Democracy party, has retired from active participation in the work of the League. His review, *Cultura Sociale*, was not long since suppressed by the ecclesiastical authorities. A report to the effect that he intended publishing a reply to the recent encyclical to the Bishops of Italy has met with his emphatic denial. Writing in *La Stampa* of Turin, under date of August 31st, he says: "It is utterly false that I dream or could have had for a moment an idea of publishing any study on the late encyclical to the Bishops of Italy. Such a thought would be incompatible with the desire I have publicly manifested of remaining faithful to all my obligations as a Catholic and a priest."

The last mentioned incident only goes to show how slow many minds are to understand that a Catholic can be virile, enterprising, energetic, and yet be ready to relinquish his most cherished plans at the voice of competent authority. Such a combination of qualities they affect to believe impossible. They have never fathomed the deep good sense of the Catholic ideal, which aims, even though it may not always succeed, at keeping due place for individual initiative and for organic control. Students of political institutions have long since recognized that the main task of government is to keep the balance true between authority and liberty. Excess in either direction is destructive—on the one hand, the knout; on the other, the torch. It should be as clearly acknowledged that in religious government the same principles hold. The individual must possess a measure of freedom, but that freedom is limited by the needs of the organism of which he forms a part; and if it does not command him to do or say what his conscience forbids, he is bound by good sense no less than by loyalty to act in conformity with its decisions. And yet not infrequently those who guide their actions by these principles are scorned as insincere or denounced as traitors to humanity.

Such has been the lot of Signor Fogazzaro, whose filial submission to the decree of the Congregation of the Index condemning his novel *Il Santo* has brought down upon him the wrath of certain of his countrymen who are opposed to Church authority. Early in the Summer a number of students of the University of Rome held a meeting to protest against his retention on the Council of Public Instruction, on the ground that his intellectual dependence on an ecclesiastical organization rendered him unfit to discharge his public duties with fairness. However, a counter-demonstration was held by students and professors to protest against this attack made by their fellows against liberty of conscience; and Signor Fogazzaro was assured of the confidence and esteem of the majority of those connected with the University. The matter was also brought up in the Chamber of Deputies. It was there made the subject of oratory on both sides, and was then suffered to drop.

Fogazzaro himself has been trying to shape his own conduct in his time of trial on the model of what his "Saint" would have done—first of all, obedience to authority; then, "Silentium." In connection with the decree, he has offered neither criticism nor defense. To the resolutions of his friends in the University he replied that he betrayed none of the duties to truth by an act which was in conformity with his faith and his

whole past. To his principal defender in the Chamber he writes: "My obedience and loyalty as a believer do not imply the enslavement of my own thought or that of any other man." His Catholic friends have imitated his ungrumbling acceptance of the decisions of Church authority, but some of them in France and in Italy have been aroused to protest by the attempt of Father James Forbes, S. J., to prove that *Il Santo* contains heresies. The well-known Catholic writer, Viscount Melchior de Vogüé, writing in *Le Figaro*, July 27th, attacks Father Forbes' presentation as being utterly biased and unfair, and makes an unpleasant charge of falsification of texts. He is especially indignant at finding the name of a man who has taught (and now humbly practices) obedience to authority, nailed to the pillory of heresiarchs in a chapter entitled: "Fogazzaro, Harnack, Tolstoi, Sabatier."

While this strife concerning the matter of obedience to the decrees of the Congregation of the Index was going on in Italy, there passed away a celebrated Italian theologian who, in his day, had suffered the same condemnation, and whose obedience and patience had gained for him a triumph. This was Canon Salvatore di Bartolo of Palermo. In 1888 he published his *Criteri Teologici*, a work which at first was received with a chorus of praise in different parts of the Church. However, in 1891, it was put on the Index of Prohibited Books. The author submitted, but thirteen years afterwards he was able to republish his book, not very materially modified, with the *Imprimatur* of the Master of the Sacred Palace. In addition to this work, he published also a series of conferences on Science and Revelation and a Catholic Catechism, in both of which he maintained the liberty of the Catholic scholar on such questions as the allegorical interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis, the theory of evolution, etc.

The Church has lost the services of another able scholar through the sudden death of Mgr. Le Camus, Bishop of La Rochelle. As preacher, educator, theologian, scripturist, ecclesiastical statesman, he has filled a prominent place in the life of the Church in France during the past forty years. In his attitude towards new views in Scripture, he was, to borrow a name from Continental politics, a Moderate Progressist. Although many of his opinions were what is called "advanced," they never drew on him the disapproval of authority. On the contrary, his latest work on *L'Oeuvre des Apotres*, (reviewed in our April-May issue of last year) obtained for him and for his methods the lofty commendation of the Holy Father himself. He was praised for following a wise middle course between "those who have more regard for novelty than for the teaching authority of the Church" and "those who in no way dare to depart from the usual exegesis of Scripture even when, faith not being at stake, the real advancement of learning requires such a departure." Bishop Le Camus' *Life of Christ* is being translated into English. The first volume is reviewed elsewhere in the present issue.

An event of more than national importance is the election of the new Superior-General of the Jesuits. After a comparatively short session, the Congregation of the Company of Jesus elected, on September 8th, the Rev. Francis Xavier Wernz, rector of the Gregorian University, to succeed

the late Father Martin. Father Wernz was born at Rottweil, Wurtemberg, in 1842, and joined the Society of Jesus at the age of fifteen. After the usual preparatory course he went to Ditton Hall and devoted himself to the study of Canon Law, which has become his specialty. In 1872 he was made professor, and in 1883 was transferred to the Gregorian University, of which, after a twenty-one years' occupancy of the chair of Canon Law, he became rector. Besides being the author of an important essay on the Law of Separation, in which he declared against the acceptance of the "associations cultuelles," he has, since 1879, been engaged on the publication of studies in certain more difficult questions of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, four volumes having already been issued. His eminence in his chosen department of learning, along with his standing as consulting member of the Congregation on Extraordinary Affairs and the Congregation of the Index, would seem fully to justify the words of Pope Pius X on the news of his election: "He is just the man for the position."

It has also been decided to undertake a history of the Society, to be divided according to nationalities, each part to be written in the language of the country of which it treats. This is a much-needed work, since not only are all the histories by Jesuit authors already in existence in Latin, but none comes down to our times, while those written by non-Jesuits are, for several reasons, unsatisfactory. The late Superior-General was very desirous of seeing the work brought to a speedy conclusion, but unfortunately, at the start, the two men selected to prepare the history of the Society in France—Père Mercier and Père Cherot—have both been called from the scene of their earthly labors.

A certain amount of natural curiosity has been manifested in various quarters concerning the present position of a former member of the Society of Jesus—Father George Tyrrell. For a time after his expulsion there was a good deal of comment on his case, proceeding almost entirely from those who opposed his views. Then followed a period of calm during which both friends and critics seemed to think reticence the truest wisdom. Latterly, however, the press of England and the Continent has begun to print items of news about him, and in America the *Boston Evening Transcript* of September 29th, presents Father Tyrrell's side of the matter in long extracts from a letter written by him to Cardinal Ferrata, Prefect of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. Since both sides have now been presented to the public there can be no indiscretion in briefly summing up the facts of the matter so far as they can be learned.

For some time before his separation from the Jesuits, Father Tyrrell's liberal views had been looked upon with distrust by the central authorities of the Society. About a year ago he submitted a statement of his views and plans to the Master General with an offer of resignation from the community; which offer he afterwards changed to the suggestion that the authorities should themselves decide on the question of his retention or dismissal, the matter even in the latter alternative to be settled as amicably as possible, and presumably in accordance with due forms of law. While a settlement was pending there appeared in an Italian newspaper a translation of a letter to a Continental professor of Anthropology

which had been privately circulated in English in pamphlet form. The authorship of this letter was attributed, and it seems justly, to Father Tyrrell. Upon satisfying themselves of this fact, his superiors dismissed him peremptorily from the Society *sine episcopo receptore*, the canonical defects of such action having been supplied by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. It may not be generally known to many even among the clergy, but an ex-Jesuit without a Bishop is *ipso facto* suspended, not merely from the exercise of jurisdiction, but from rights of his priesthood. By virtue of his expulsion, then, Father Tyrrell became unable to say Mass. It should be mentioned, however, that he has not been censured directly by the Holy Father, or by any Bishop or Congregation, nor have any of his writings been condemned by any tribunal nor placed on the Index of Prohibited Books.

———

Meanwhile a Continental archbishop wrote to the Sacred Congregation offering to accept Father Tyrrell as a priest of his diocese. In reply he was informed that he might do so only on condition that Father Tyrrell should engage himself to submit to some competent person, to be appointed by the archbishop, not only writings intended for publication, but all his personal correspondence on religious subjects. This latter and unusual restriction was evidently inserted on account of the letter whose publication had brought matters to a crisis. When this offer was submitted to Father Tyrrell, he declined to avail himself of it on the twofold groudn that it was penal in its nature though he had not received any trial, and that it was dishonorable to himself. There the matter rests for the present. Passing from Father Tyrrell's canonical to his personal position with relation to the Church, one finds the situation more encouraging. His latest book, *Lex Credendi*, has had a reassuring effect on the minds of many who were suspicious of his orthodoxy. And although his letter of protest to Cardinal Ferrata was evidently written in great stress of mind and some bitterness of spirit, he states in its conclusion: "I still believe and will go on believing and defending the Roman Church. . . . I accept the Church and her saints as my guidance in faith and morals."

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Life of Christ—by Mgr E Le Camus, Bishop of La Rochelle, France. Translated by William A. Hickey, priest of the diocese of Springfield. Vol. I. New York. The Cathedral Library Association. pp. xxix, 450.

This volume is the first instalment of the English translation of Bp. Le Camus' valuable *Vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus Christ*. The work of the learned prelate appeared some fifteen years ago and was reckoned at once among the best French Lives of Christ. Since that time it has been rendered into German, Italian, and other foreign languages. It has also passed through several editions, and it is from the sixth French edition, published in 1901, that the present English translation has been made. During the interval that elapsed between the first appearance of his work and this, his latest edition of it, Bp. Le Camus had ample time to improve the form and contents of his Life of Christ, and in many ways he made the most of it. As reprinted in 1901 the work contains important additions and corrections suggested by his three journeys through Bible lands, and also by his further study of the literary and critical problems connected with the evangelical narratives. And we naturally feel thankful to Rev. W. A. Hickey for rendering into English that edition which embodies the best information and represents the most mature views of the learned prelate.

Bp. Le Camus' work opens with a long *Introduction* wherein he treats with great force and clearness the topics preliminary to his biography of the Savior. He first sets forth in a plausible manner the reasons for regarding as an actual fact the manifestation of the Godhead in Jesus, the Redeemer of the world. He next deals with the literary sources of information at his disposal for writing a life of Christ, insisting particularly on the individual characteristics, manner of origin, and historical value of our canonical Gospels. To this he subjoins a summary description of the Holy Land and its people in Our Lord's time. The three chapters which make up this *Introduction* will amply repay a careful reading of their contents, even though one may not see his way fully to agree with certain critical positions of the Rt. Rev. author, notably with his favorable appreciation of the passage in Josephus concerning Christ, and with his theory regarding the manner in which our first three Gospels originated.

The body of the work is naturally divided into three principal parts: the earlier life of Jesus, His public life, and His last days on earth. Hardly less natural are the leading subdivisions which Bp. Le Camus adopts in his treatment of these three great periods of Our Lord's life. It is indeed true that many readers of his work will miss at first the usual division by years in the narrative of Christ's public ministry. But they will soon feel at home with the bishop's division of that period into the three stages of *general exploration, formation in Galilee, and struggle in Judea.*

In his first volume, the translator has included only,—besides the "Introduction" already described,—the history of Our Lord's earlier life, and of the first stage of His ministry in Galilee. He has rendered the French original with a remarkable accuracy and elegance, so that the readers of his volume while supplied with a faithful transcript of Bp. Le Camus' views in matters appertaining to doctrine, chronology, geography, exegesis, criticism, etc., will but seldom, if ever, discover through the translation the primitive French words and idioms.

There remains to us to give a few samples of the scientific positions which the learned prelate has thought well to take after a prolonged study and a mature reflection, in the part of his work which now appears in an English dress. He plainly states (p. 158) that "there is no good proof that Joseph had reached a mature age, and much less old age, when he began to consider this alliance (his alliance with Mary); and there is not the slightest reason why Christian art, in obedience to ancient legends, should have obstinately persisted in casting upon this patriarchal union the ridiculous appearance to which the ill-assorted marriage of an aged man to a young girl is always exposed." He dates "the reign of Tiberius from the time of his association with the Empire" (p. 104 footn.); prefers the reading "Bethany" to that of "Bethabara" in John i, 28, (p. 122 footn. 2); and takes the expression τη επαιριον usually rendered by "the next day" in John i, 29, as simply equivalent to "later on" (p. 126 note). According to him St. Luke's genealogy of Our Lord "extends to Jesus through Mary His mother, and not through His adopted father, Joseph," (p. 148 sqq.). He decidedly objects to some of the fanciful meanings oftentimes ascribed to the name "Mary," and strongly protests against the influence of certain apocryphal Gospels "on the histories of Mary and Joseph, which an ill-inspired piety thought necessary to write" (pp. 156, 157, footn.).) He declares it "impossible to fix even the exact year in which Jesus was born" (p. 193). In connection with the

Flight into Egypt, he writes: "The old sycamore-tree that sheltered the travellers is still pointed out, and branches of it are presented to credulous pilgrims" (p. 219, footn.). At page 228 (footn.) he says: "The two passages in St. Luke ii, 40 and 52, both establish a correlation between the physical development and the moral development, so evident that it seems difficult to admit that the one was real, the other only apparent. It is for theology to explain the mystery, if it can, by observing that the present participle πληρουμενον, poorly translated in the Vulgate by *plenus*, expresses, as well as ευξανεν and προεκοπτεν, the idea of a fact not accomplished, but which is being gradually accomplished." With regard to the Temptation of Jesus he thinks that we should "concede that the Gospel story relates to us in metaphors, the threefold interior combat which Jesus sustained against Satan and from which he came forth completely victorious;" and a little farther he adds: "It was in imagination that he placed Him on the pinnacle of the Temple and on the mountain, and it was before His mind only that he made the Kingdoms of the earth and the depths of the abyss to be in evidence." (pp. 266, 267). The pond or piscina of Bethesda he regards as "simply a basin of mineral waters, like those found in Palestine. . . . There waited the infirm looking for the propitious moment when the subterranean caloric, suddenly breaking loose, caused considerable agitation on the surface of the water and stirred up the metallic salts that gave efficacy to the bath." (p. 335). At page 223 (footn.), Bp. Le Camus tells us: "There is something providential in Joseph's selection of Nazareth for a domicile after the return from Egypt. Isaias had said that the Messiah would be a rod, a sprout (Netzer) out of Jesse. Jesus, later on commonly called the Nazarene, was, then, taken by all for the rod of the prophecy. . . . Inasmuch as this same figure of the sprout is found,—not, however, with the term Netzer,—applied to the Messiah by Jeremias xxiii, 5; xxxiii, 15; Zach, iii, 8; vi, 12, we can understand how the play upon words suggested by the text of Isaias was a temptation to St. Matthew ii, 23. Netzer reminds him of Ναζαραιος. Especially desirous of showing the perfect fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New, and heedless of the fact that Nazareth had not been mentioned even once in the Bible, the Evangelist thought it proper to conclude that the Netzer of the prophets was realized in Jesus the Nazarene." After explaining how St. Luke wrongly inserted a clause in his citation of Isai. lxi "as the real text," the author adds: "These inaccuracies may lead to a modification of certain rigid theories on inspiration,

but they do not endanger the authority of the Evangelist" (p. 354, footn.). At page 373 (footn.) he informs us that "this cure (that of Peter's wife's mother) is incorrectly placed, in Matt. viii, 14, much later, during another sojourn at Capharnaum." Finally, after setting forth the variations in the first three Gospels concerning the place assigned to two miracles which are recorded in St. Matthew's narrative in immediate connection with Levi's banquet, Bp. Le Camus significantly exclaims: "Where must we look for perfect accuracy?" (p. 399, footn.).

To conclude. The literary value of the English translation of this first volume, and the scientific handling of the various topics treated therein should secure for it a large number of readers. They also lead us to look for the prompt issue of the other two volumes which are to complete this new translation of Bp. Le Camus' valuable *Life of Christ.*

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on Gesenius, edited by FRANCIS BROWN, D. D., D. Litt., with the co-operation of S. R. DRIVER, D. D., Litt. D., and CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D., D. Litt. 8vo, pp. xix, 1127. $7.50, net. Houghton, Mifflin and Company. Boston, New York, and Chicago, 1906.

It affords one great pleasure to call the attention of the readers of THE NEW YORK REVIEW to the recent publication, in its completed form, of this very important work for the study of the original text of the Old Testament. The parts of this Lexicon were given to the public by instalments since 1891, and as time went on, scholars thus made aware of the scientific value of its contents were naturally desirous of seeing it brought to completion and published in the form of a single volume. Their long-cherished desire is now fulfilled, and their confident anticipation of the increased usefulness of such a work when completed, amply realized. The new Lexicon embodies the results of the long and painstaking labors of three leading critics of the day, two of whom, Dr. Brown and Dr. Briggs, are eminent teachers in the Union Theological Seminary (New York), and the third, Dr. Driver, is the well-known Regius professor of Hebrew in Oxford University. It is the work of ripe and conscientious scholarship, and decidedly the best Hebrew-English Lexicon thus far published. In fact, in several important respects, it deserves to be considered as both more

thorough and more serviceable than even the best and latest German work of a similar kind, to wit, Prof. Frants Buhl's fourteenth edition of Gesenius' Lexicon, which appeared in 1905.

When the editors of this new Lexicon of the Old Testament entered upon their arduous task, they thought it well to divide the work among themselves. Canon Driver agreed to make a fresh and complete study of the prepositions, adverbs, and other particles, and the personal responsibility of this leading Hebrew scholar extends to these and only to a few words besides. Dr. Briggs took up and prepared the articles on the main terms important to Old Testament religion, theology and psychology. Lastly, Prof. Brown accepted all the remainder of the work inclusive of the arrangement and general supervision of the volume, so that the great and unquestionable merits of the book are chiefly due to this untiring and most careful scholar. They also resolved to examine for themselves each Hebrew or Aramaic word wherever it occurs in the Old Testament, so as to make sure of its total actual use, and thereby of its true and exact meaning. This they did, and, as a result, every page of the volume bears the distinct impress of the most searching study of the Hebrew Bible. They likewise made up their minds to utilize the published materials for the study of the languages cognate with Hebrew, and throughout the volume reference is constantly made to the leading works on Arabic, Assyrian, Syriac, Aramaic, Ethiopic, etc. Again, they deemed it advisable not to follow blindly the *Textus Receptus* of the Hebrew Bible and to avail themselves freely of the best-ascertained results of exegesis, lower and higher criticism; and in point of fact, the present volume bears witness to their judicious use of the material available for the emendation of the ordinary Hebrew Text. Lastly, they rightly adopted the scientific plan of giving the words according to their stems, and wisely provided for the needs of the beginner by inserting in their alphabetical place the words whose root he might not make out at once, together with a cross-reference to the exact place where they are treated in detail. In these, and in many other ways, they have succeeded in bringing out at volume in essential respects new and original, and truly conducive to thorough Biblical study.

As might well be expected in a work of such difficulty and magnitude, imperfections of various kinds can be noticed. The editors themselves are fully aware of this as proved by their long list (pp. 1119-1127) of "Addenda et Corrigenda" at the end of the volume, and also by their distinct avowal of the less satisfactory character of

the Parts issued earliest (Preface, p. x). But besides these acknowledged defects, one may well question the wisdom of giving separately, as they have done, their Lexicon of Biblical Aramaic (pp. 1078-1118). Above all, one must regret that for reasons of a purely practical order, they have not seen their way to complete their work by the addition of an English-Hebrew index.

Despite these slight imperfections, and other minor defects noticeable in the body of the volume, Dr. Brown's Hebrew-English Lexicon forms a most valuable contribution for the scientific study of the Old Testament, and deserves a hearty welcome on the part of all those who are interested in the advance of Biblical learning.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

La Critique des Traditions Religieuses Chez Les Grecs, des Origines Au Temps de Plutarque—par PAUL DECHARME. Alphonse Picard, Paris, 1904. pp. xiv-518.

The religious system of any nation is always a fascinating subject for investigation. But in the religion of Greece there is an added interest, due to a fact which has never failed to puzzle and even shock the ardent admirer of Hellas. Here we have the strange anomaly of a people, whose genius has explored and perfected almost every phase of intellectual and artistic excellence, accepting and professing a religion so crude and absurd as to make us wonder how it could even have secured a foothold on the soil of Attica. Imagine a cultured and refined nation ascribing to their deities vices, and passions which are a disgrace even to human nature! As Max Müller has said in his *Lectures on the Science of Language* (2nd series, p. 404), the Greek poets related of their gods "what would make the most savage of the Red Indians creep and shudder"—how Kronos maimed his father Uranos, how this same Kronos swallowed his own children and years afterward vomited them out alive, how Demeter, the sister of Zeus, ate of Pelops' shoulder at a banquet of the gods. These are some of the horrors which the Greek parent related to his children, when telling the story of his national gods.

Now while the vast majority of Greeks held to these beliefs, there arose from time to time some few thinkers who, protesting against these degrading fables, sought to explain their origin as purely human. And the success of their attempts is wrapped up in the history of the nation. At first these investigations in religious and scientific matter

seemed nothing short of blasphemy. The fate of Socrates and others proves only too clearly that as long as religion and politics were inseparable, it was dangerous to touch these Homeric myths. But once political liberty was lost, then a greater freedom of expression was allowed in the domain of religious belief. Hence the value of Prof. Decharme's present volume, which traces the history of this struggle from the age of Homer to the end of Greek pagan times. In this work these three questions are discussed: Have the Greek poets told the true story of their gods? Do these gods take an interest in humanity? Do these gods really exist? And to obtain a solution of these questions he goes to school to the keenest minds in ancient Greece, setting their views before his readers so clearly as to allow the latter to see for themselves the views advanced by the various schools of Greek thought. The chronological division falls naturally into three periods, the first of which goes from the Homeric poems to the immediate predecessors of Socrates; the second period is devoted to the religious opinions of Socrates and the other founders of philosophic systems; while the last period treats of Euhemerism and the religious views of Plutarch. In a word, we have in this volume a succinct account of religious criticism from the days of the Iliad and the Odyssey to the very threshold of Christianity. It is no easy task to give an appreciation of such an excellent work. Besides the abundance of solid and interesting matter contained therein, the reader will see it presented in such a charming style that he will find it difficult to lay the volume aside until the last page has been finished.

But there is a chapter that deserves special notice. In it the author gives a very good account of Greek impiety and the court trials that arose therefrom. After stating Aristotle's definition of impiety, he goes on to enumerate the various kinds of impiety. Anyone had the right to denounce such crimes, which were then tried before the ordinary courts, the punishment being determined by the Heliasts. Then follows a discussion of the trials for the revelation of the Eleusinian Mysteries and the mutilation of the Hermes—which crimes prove clearly that impiety was very much on the increase. Nor did the natural scientists fare any better. For the law of Diopeithes was enacted against those who tried to explain on purely natural grounds the atmospheric phenomena, or who dared to strip the sun and moon of their divinity. All Athens looked on the sun as a god, wherefore Anaxagoras was brought before the judges for saying that it was only on incandescent stone. Protagoras was banished from

Attic soil for having said that it was impossible to know of the existence of the gods. The trial and condemnation of Socrates prove beyond doubt the existence of laws which punished with death the denial of the gods of the state or the introduction of new deities. Not that the Greeks believed their religion to be the only one on earth, nor that the palace of Olympus was vast enough to contain all the gods of the universe. On the contrary we find new deities admitted from time to time into public worship—but only after they had been approved by the state. However, this may have been a compromise in order to stem the tide of impiety which refused to be proscribed by law. For atheism finally ended by being tolerated. Polybius speaks of a certain admiral who had erected an altar to Impiety and another to Iniquity. In conclusion it may be said that while the law at Athens in the fifth century B. C. was very severe against atheism, still public spirit was not so rigorous, judging by the small number of trials for impiety and the still smaller number of convictions secured.

JOHN F. MORGAN.

A Living Wage: Its Ethical and Economic Aspects. Dissertation for the Doctorate of Theology at the Catholic University of America—by the REV. JOHN AUGUSTINE RYAN, S. T. L., New York. The Macmillan Co. Cr. 8vo., pp. VXI, 361.

In a brief but encouraging introduction to this work, Prof. Ely takes occasion to point out in a kindly way a defect in the general attitude of religious teachers towards economic questions. He acknowledges the great good done in the stimulating of the moral conscience, but he feels that "enlightenment has not kept pace with good intention." Accordingly, "the plain man of whom we hear so much has a feeling that our teachers and preachers are vague and indefinite." Among ourselves, with the privileges of speaking freely without danger of wounding feelings, we might give vent to stronger criticism of the vagueness our of pulpit economists and the purely aprioristic arguments of not a few theologians.

It is a source of satisfaction, therefore, that Dr. Ryan has taken up and studied this basic question of a "living wage." Combining the knowledge of a trained theologian with that of a deep student of sociology and political economy, he is well equipped to grasp with sympathetic spirit, the apparent conflict of religion and ethics with some received opinions in economic thought. His two-fold training

has qualified him to take into consideration the whole situation and has saved him from the tendency to ignore one or other of the essential factors, which is so common in either strictly religious or strictly economic works on such topics.

The book is divided into four sections. In the first section, which is largely historical, the author shows how the ethical element was eliminated from the field of economics by the early economists who considered that wages were regulated by necessary and arbitrary economic laws. Later writers thought that justice would best be secured by unrestricted bargaining without considering the relative strength of the parties to the conflict. After tracing the evolution of economic thought on the matter during the past century the author exposes its inconsistency with industrial history and the reaction that has sprung up among economic writers of the present day.

In spite of this progress, however, our laws and law makers and industrial interests generally are so deeply sunk in the former fallacy that those in power still think and act along the old lines. And yet, as the author points out, this policy of (nominally) free barter of labor was not always in force. In England wages were formerly regulated by law, and they were guarded in a quasi-legal manner through guilds, custom, and the regulation of the price of goods. But with the great impetus given to industry by new inventions and discoveries selfish personal interests caused the gradual withdrawal of the protections afforded by the former safeguards. And while it is true that the teaching of Christian theological and ethical writers ever continued to protest against the present regime, still these writers made little attempt at this work of studying the situation and proposing a constructive policy. In recent years New Zealand both by legislation and by the scale of wages set forth by the labor unions is aiming at a more specific solution of the problem. It is also true that the great mass of people have had their attention directed more or less to the question of late, and they are a unit in believing that a moral factor does enter into the problem and that there is such a thing as fair wages.

In the second section of the work the author discusses the basis, nature and content of the "right to a living wage." It is in this section that his painstaking study and strong grasp of his subject are best evidenced. Starting out with the proposition that the laborer's claim to a "living wage" is of the nature of a right, and further that this right is individual, natural, and absolute, he reviews the

arguments advanced by the hedonists, positivists, etc., and succeeds in making out a good case for his contention that the source of natural rights is the dignity of the human person, while their scope is determined by the person's essential needs. In further development of this topic, there follows an admirable discussion on the rights to a personal and to a family "living wage." Analyzing the different schools of thought on this subject, the writer shows that the evolution of industry brought in its wake fallacies which have to be discarded if we would get at the heart of the problem. This section is brought to a close by a very instructive use of statistics, in a chapter entitled "A Concrete Estimate of a Living Wage."

It is true that data sufficient to generalize on the subject are not available,—no one realizes this more than Dr. Ryan,—yet by a skilful meaning of collected facts, some amazing conditions are exposed. Statistics are also employed with great effect in the analysis of the economic facts by which the right to a living wage is conditioned. The evils attendant on monopolistic combinations and unwise methods of rapidly displacing men by machinery, as well as unnecessary overproduction, are well stated. This ground is splendidly reviewed, and the writer shows a familiarity with current thought on these matters which is seldom surpassed. We are next led to consider the vexatious problem of the forces that regulate price. This storm center of economic wrangling has been treated quite clearly. In four brief chapters the author discusses in a popular though accurate manner the subjects of rent, profit, interest and wages. Having thus treated the question of rights, Dr. Ryan devotes the concluding section of the book to the obligations corresponding to those rights.

In addition to its importance as a scientific exposition of what has been too long left a vague theological view, Dr. Ryan's work cannot but do a great deal of good by stimulating others to enter the same field. The field he has chosen is practically unbroken ground; at most the surface has only been scratched; and the data need careful searching. But in spite of these difficulties, Dr. Ryan has attacked the problems with the true spirit of a pioneer, handling them with a courage and a frankness which are admirable. A complete bibliography with a convenient index fittingly round out a very timely volume.